The Central Law Journal.

ST. LOUIS, DECEMBER 21, 1888.

CURRENT EVENTS.

OUR INDEX NUMBER.—Our next number (index) will be the last number of this volume. This number will bear date December 28, 1888, but as its preparation requires much more time and labor than an ordinary number, it will not probably be issued on that day, but a few days thereafter. If, therefore, any of our subscribers observe that the last number is not received on the accustomed day, let them not mourn as those who have no hope, for it will assuredly be soon forthcoming.

Christmas Comes but Once a Year — more's the pity—is undoubtedly the comment, express or implied, of all the youths of Christendom, and of many children of a larger growth. We, although in the "sere and yellow leaf," are in full sympathy with our juniors, and have tender recollections of alas! too many by-gone festivals.

As before the issuance of another number of this JOURNAL will occur this great anniversary which binds together all Christians of all lands, tongues, kindred and people, we take this occasion to tender to all our subscribers, and especially to their olive branches, the compliments of the season, wishing them each and all a "Merry Christmas," and many happy returns of the day.

The Birmingham Horror Lynch Law.—
We presume that all of our readers have seen in the newspapers full accounts of the deplorable occurrences which have recently taken place at Birmingham, Ala. We do not propose to recite the melancholy details of this tragedy, but for our present purpose it is sufficient to say that an atrocious crime was committed, that the culprit was in the custody of the officers of the law, that an attempt was made by citizens to rescue him for purposes of immediate vengeance, and that a conflict ensued in which a number of lives were lost.

Vol. 27-No. 25.

We think the occasion suitable to renewour protest, not only against the "wild justice of revenge," which is dignified by the title of "lynch law," but also against the inexcusable delay and inefficiency in the administration of criminal law, which, in the opinion of many people, palliate, and even justify such contempt of social order and the majesty of the law.

When resistance to the law is inaugurated no one can foretell its extent or duration, what will be the consequences, nor who will be the sufferers. It is clearly the duty of legislatures to provide for the severe and condign punishment of those who attempt to take the law into their own hands, and not less imperative is the duty to withdraw the temptation to commit this offense by punishing promptly, certainly and severely, crimes which are likely to provoke popular venge-To the shame of the administration of criminal law in many of our States, it must be said that neither one nor the other of these things is effectually accomplished. Rarely, indeed, are the instigators of a riot, in which human life is lost, brought to deserved punishment, and equally rare are the cases in which atrocious criminals are brought to justice, except after long delays and innumerable opportunities of escaping deserved retribution by reason of the casualties incident to those delays. In a large majority of such cases the delays acquit, and justice is put to open shame.

While this state of things continues no sane man can wonder that, when horrible crimes shock the sensibilities of whole communities and rouse them to frenzy, the lawless and the thoughtless do not hesitate, in defiance of the constituted authorities, to wreak vengeance upon the wretches who, in popular estimation, have forfeited their lives by the commission of those crimes. In such cases legislators and courts must needs perceive a divided duty. Justice to the accused imperatively requires that he shall have a fair trial and every reasonable facility for establishing his innocence. On the other hand, it is no less essential to the dignity of the law and the security and good order of the community that crime should be punished, and especially that atrocious crimes should be promptly, as well as certainly and severely punished.

It is but too evident to all who read our criminal codes and our reports of criminal trials that, in most of the States, the administration of the law is far too lax, that justice leans far too much to mercy's side, and that too many and too long delays are permitted to intervene between the arrest of the defendant and the final decision of the case. One, two, three, even four years, are often allowed to elapse before the final trial.

We deprecate and protest against both these evils, but we think that the delays of justice, reprehensible as they are, do not in the slightest degree palliate or excuse the contempt of law and order which prompt men to the commission of deeds of violence and actual murder. The delay of justice is certainly a weakness, but is entitled to charitable consideration, as it is often prompted by motives of humanity.

NOTES OF RECENT DECISIONS.

MISSOURI LAND TITLES—FRENCH AND SPANISH GRANTS—MISSOURI COMPROMISE—ScHOOLS—SIXTEENTH SECTION.—Within a few days past the Supreme Court of the United States decided a case which is venerable for its antiquity, being no less than thirty-five years old, and notable as the latest of a series of decisions involving the title to land in Missouri, held or claimed under the governments of France and Spain.

The suit was commenced in 1853. The plaintiff, Glasgow, suing on behalf of the school board, sought to recover possession of a tract of land, now of great value, lying within the city of St. Louis, and being part of the sixteenth section under the surveys authorized by the United States. It was contended on behalf of the plaintiff that, under the act of congress of 1820. known as the Missouri Compromise Act, the sixteenth section in each township of public lands was devoted to common schools, and, therefore, that he was entitled to recover.

For the defendants, it was insisted that the land in controversy was not, in 1820, public land or the property of the United States at all; that it was then private property, and had been for more than seventeen years.

It will be remembered that in 1800 Spain

ceded to France the province of Louisiana, which included Missouri: that in 1803 France ceded it to the United States, and in both treaties the grantee engaged to protect the rights of the inhabitants. In fulfillment of this duty congress, between 1803 and 1812. enacted several statutes and appointed several boards, and in the latter year passed a comprehensive act confirming the titles of all persons who, on December 20, 1803, held possession of land, claiming it under the authority of either France or Spain. Defendants claim title under this act, alleging that their ancestor, Peter Lindell, in 1827, purchased the land in controversy from parties who held it in 1803, under color of title from France or Spain. The supreme court has, in several cases,1 decided that titles to land confirmed by the act of congress of 1812, were valid, and were not abrogated by the Missouri compromise of 1820; so that all the defendants had to do was to show by sufficient evidence that their title was among those French and Spanish titles which were confirmed by the act of 1812. This, after many years of litigation and several adverse decisions, they have succeeded in doing to the satisfaction of the court of last resort.

¹ Guitard v. Stoddard, 16 How. 491; Milburn v. Hortiz, 1 Black (U. S.), 595.

CORPORATION — DISSOLUTION — CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—TRUST—DIRECTORS—TRUSTEES.

—We learn from a newspaper paragraph that the New York Court of Appeals has recently decided a rather novel case, involving the law of corporations, and the consequences which follow the dissolution of those bodies by judicial decree.

It seems that the attorney-general of the State instituted, on behalf of the State, proceedings against the Broadway Surface Railway Company, which resulted in a decree dissolving that corporation.

It appears that the legislature of the State transferred some of the assets of the defunct corporation to the city, and the question arose whether its action in this respect was constitutional. The newspaper report is not full, and does not set forth all the facts. It is in the following words:

"The court held that the dissolution of the company did not involve the forfeiture of its

franchises, but that these survived and passed, on the dissolution of the company, to its directors, as trustees for the creditors and stockholders, until some competent court should appoint a receiver, and that the legislature acted in violation of constitutional rights of property in attempting to transfer some of the company's assets to the city. The court said that the dissolution of a corporation has not, naturally, any other effect upon its contracts or property rights than the death of a natural person has upon his. In condemning the legal view set up by the attorney-general, the court expressed itself in unmistakable terms. It said: 'The contention that securities representing a large part of the world's wealth are beyond the reach of the protection which the constitution gives to property, and are subject to the arbitrary will of successive legislatures to sanction or destroy at their pleasure or discretion, is a proposition so repugnant to reason and justice, as well as the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race, in respect to the security of rights of property, that there is little reason to suppose that it will ever receive the sanction of the judiciary, and we desire in unqualified terms to express our disapprobation of such a doctrine." "

We shall look forward with some curiosity to the full report of the case, as we cannot very clearly perceive grounds upon which the legislature acted, nor why the Court of Appeals should have found it necessary to decide so very plain a proposition.

FOREIGN JUDGMENTS.

- 1. Classes of Foreign Judgments.
- 2. Judgment in rem.
- 3. Judgments in personam.
- 4. Judgments in the Courts of Sister States.
- 5. Judgments in the Federal Courts.
- 6. Judgments where Court has no Jurisdiction.
- 7. Attacking Foreign Judgment.
- 8. Impeaching Record of Foreign Judgment.
- 9. Denying Authority of Attorney to Appear.
- Foreign Judgments Simply Evidence of Debt.
 Privileges and Priorities of Foreign Judgments.
- Privileges and Priorities of Foreign Judgments.
 Tendency of Decisions to Restrict Foreign Judments.
- 13. Conclusiveness of Foreign Judgments.
- 14. Pendency of Suit in Another State.
- Classes of Foreign Judgments.—Foreign judgments are either in rem or in personam.¹
 - ¹ Story Confl. L. § 584. See also 3 Burge, Com. on Dias, 2 U. S. Law Mag. 433.

In order that a judgment may be valid and entitled the recognition of foreign tribunals, it is indispensable that the court pronouncing the judgment should have a lawful jurisdiction over the case, over the subject of the action, and over the parties to the action; that the court had such jurisdiction must be clearly shown; ² and if the jurisdiction fails in either of these respects the judgment will be a nullity, without obligation and not entitled to be respected or enforced beyond the jurisdiction of the court rendering it, whether the judgment be in rem or in personam.³

But if the judgment of a foreign court contravenes the *lex loci*, it will not be treated as conclusive in the courts of the State or country whose laws have been disregarded.⁴

Vattel says that it is the province of every sovereignty to administer justice in all places within its own territory and under its own jurisdiction, to take cognizance of the crimes committed there and by the contro-

Col. & For. Law, pt. 2, ch. 24, pp. 1014 to 1080; 2 Smith, Lead. Cas. (2d ed.) 436, note. Some divide judgments into three classes, to-wit: (1) in rem, (2) in personam, and (3) mixed, in rem and in personam. See Burgundus, Tract. 3, n. 1, 2, pp. 84-85; 1 Boullenois, obs. 25, p. 602. Lord Kames in his work on Equity (see 2 Kames, Eq. (3d ed.) 365), makes another distinction as to foreign judgments, namely: "suits sustaining and suits dismissing a claim." He says: "A foreign suit sustaining the claim is not one of those universal titles which ought to be made effectual everywhere. It is a title that depends on the authority of the court whence it issued, and therefore has no coercive authority extraterritorium." But this seems to be a refinnement of distinctions not warranted by the ancient common law and not sanctioned by the modern decisions. See Gelston v. Hoyt, 13 Johns. (N. Y.) 561; Gelston v. Hoyt, 3 Wheat. 246; The Bennet, 1 Dodson, 175-180;

Starkie, Ev. pt. 2, § 80.

Smith v. Mutual Life Ins. Co., 14 Allen (Mass.), 339: Ferguson v. Mahon, 11 Ad. & El. 179-182-183; 1 Boullenois obs. 25, pp. 618-620. The judgment of a competent Spanish court, having jurisdiction of the case, made after the cession of Louisiana, but whilst the country though ceded was de facto in the possession of Spain, and subject to Spanish law, has been held to be valid, so far as it affects the private rights of the parties. Keene v. McDonough, 8 Pet. 308.

8 Rose v. Himely, 4 Cr. (U. S.) 269-270; Andrews v. Herriot, 4 Cow. (N. Y.) 524 n; Shumway v. Stillman, 6 Wend. (N. Y.) 447; Noyes v. Butler, 6 Barb. (N. Y.) 613; Middlesex Bank v. Butman, 29 Me. 19; Hall v. Williams, 6 Pick. (Mass.) 232; s. C., 17 Am. Dec. 356; Woodward v. Tremere, 6 Pick. (Mass.) 354; Bissell v. Briggs, 9 Mass. 462; s. C., 6 Am. Dec. 88; Buchanan v. Rucker, 9 East, 192; Don v. Lippmann, 5 Clark & Finn. 1-20-21; Cavan v. Stewart, 1 Stark. 525; Ferguson v. Mahon, 11 Ad. & El. 179-182-188, 1 Stark. Ev., pt. 2, p. 214, § 68; Henry on For. Law, 18 n; Id. 23-73; Story, Confl. L. §§ 539-546-547-586.

Dias v. Morrell, 2 U. S. Law Mag. 431; Lorellhe v.

versies that arise within it, and says that, in consequence of this right of jurisdiction, the decision made by the judge of the place within the extent of his authority ought to respected, and take effect even in foreign countries.⁵ But this doctrine has not been generally accepted.⁶

2. Judgments in rem.—Where the matter in controversy is immovable property, as land, the judgment pronounced in the forum rei sitæ is of universal obligation as to all matters or right and title which it professes to determine; but a foreign judgment relating thereto will be of no obligation. And the same principle applies to all proceedings in rem against movable property within the jurisdiction of the court pronouncing the judgment. But the judgment must be bona fide and without fraud, for if fraud intervenes it will avoid the force and validity of the judgment, however well founded the jurisdiction.

⁵ Vattel, B. 2 ch. 7, §§ 84-85.

6 See Story Confl. L., 5 586.

⁷ See Cammell v. Sewell, 5 H. & N. 728; Rafad v.
 Verelst, 2 Wm. Black. 1058; Story, Confl. L. §§ 382, note 3, 532-545-551-591; 1 Boullenois, obs. 25, pp. 618-619-623; 1 Hertii Opera, de Collis, § 4, n. 73, pp. 153-154; J. Voet, ad. Pand, Tom. 1 lib. 42, tit. 1, n. 41, p. 462

8 French v. Hall, 9 N. H. 137; S. C., 32 Am. Dec. 341; Croudson v. Loenard, 4 Cr. (U. S.) 434; Gelston v. Hoyt, 3 Wheat. (U.S.) 246; Williams v. Armroyd, 7 Cr. (U. S.) 423; Rose v. Himely, 4 Cr. (U. S.) 241; Hudson v. Guestier, 4 Cr. (U. S.) 293; The Mary, 9 Cr. (U. S.) 126-142-146; Bradstreet v. Neptune Ins. Co., 3 Sumner C. C. 600; s. c., 2 Law. Rep. 262-264-265; Peters v. The Warren Ins. Co., Sumner C. C. 389; s. c., 1 Law Rep. 222; Magoun v. New England Ins. Co., 1 Story C. C. 157; s. c., 3 Law Rep. 127-130-131; The Mary Anne, Ware (U. S.) 104; Whitney v. Walsh, 1 Cush. (Mass.) 29; s. c., 47 Am. Dec. 590; Barrow v. West, 23 Pick. (Mass.) 270; Monroe v. Douglas, 4 Sandf. Ch. (N. Y.) 179; Andrews v. Herriot, 4 Cow. (N. Y.) 520, and n.; Grant v. McLachlin, 4 Johns. (N. Y.) 34; Blad v. Bamfield, 3 Swanst. 604-605; Cartrege v. Imrie, L. R. 4 H. L. 414; Harmer v. Bell, 7 Moore, P. C. 267; s. C , 22 Eng. L. & Eq. 62.

9 Magoun v. The New England Ins. Co., 1 Story C. C. 157; s. c., 3 Law Rep. 127-130-131; Bradstreet v. The Neptune Ins. Co., 3 Sumner C. C. 600; s. c., 2 Law Rep. 262-264-265; Duchess of Kingston's Case, 11 State Trials, 261-262; s. c., 20 Howell, State Trials, 355-538 note; Bowles v. Orr, 1 Younge & C. 464; Starkie, Ev. pt. 2, 56 77-79-83; Harg. Law Tracts, 449-479-483. It must appear that the proceedings upon which the judgment is founded were regular, and that the parties interested in rem had notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to appear and defend their interests, either personally or by representative, before the judgment was pronounced. Bradstreet v. The Neptune Ins. Co., 3 Sumner, 600; s. c., 2 Law Rep. 263; Magoun v. New England Ins. Co., 1 Story C. C. 157; 8. C., 3 Law Rep. 127-130; Monroe v. Douglas, 4 Sandf. Ch. (N. Y.) 180; Sawyer v. Maine Fire & Marine Ins. Co.,

12 Mass. 291.

But fraud practiced in the recovery of a judgment cannot be pleaded in an action thereon brought in another State, unless such a defense could be made in the courts of the State where the judgment was rendered. 10

Proceedings by a creditor against the personal property of a debtor in the hands of a third person, or against debts due to him by such third person, are treated as in some sense proceedings in rem, and are regarded as entitled to the same consideration as proceedings in rem. 11 In such cases, the existence of the property seized or the debt garnished within the territory constitutes just grounds of proceeding to enforce the rights of the plaintiff and discharge his debt, at least so far as the property or debt will do so.12 If the defendant does not appear in the suit, the proceedings will be regarded as a proceeding in rem and the judgment will bind the property or debt, but not be binding upon the debtor as a decree in personam would be.13

Such judgments are held conclusive, in

¹⁰ Barras v. Bidwell, 3 Woods C. C. 5. A bill in equity for an injunction against the use in one State of a judgment rendered in another State, cannot be maintained on the ground that the judgment was obtained by false and fraudulent testimony. Metcalf v. Gilmore, 59 N. H. 417; S. C., 47 Am. Rep. 217.

11 See Bissell v. Briggs, 9 Mass. 468; s. c.,6 Am. Dec. 88; Ocean Ins. Co. v. Portsmouth Marine Ry. Co., 3 Met. (Mass.) 420; Danforth v. Penny, 3 Met. (Mass.) 564; 3 Burge, Comm. on Col. & For. Law, pt. 2, ch. 24, pp. 1014-1019. To make any judgment effectual the court must possess and exercise the rightful jurisdiction over the res, and also over the person, at least so far as the res is concerned, for otherwise it will be disregarded. If the jurisdiction be well founded over the res but not over the person, except as to the res, the judgment will not be either conclusive or binding upon the party in personam, although it may be in rem. Story Confl. L. § 592a. Respecting the attachment of wages in a foreign State: See Burlington & M. R. R. Co. v. Thompson, 31 Kan. 180; s. c., 47 Am. Rep. 497; Gilbert v. Black, 1 Leg. Chron. 132; Wilson v. Joseph (Ind.), 5 West. Rep. 681; Stevens v. Brown, 20 W. Va. 450; Mooney v. Union Pac. R. R. Co., 60 Iowa, 346; The City of New Bedford, 20 Fed. Rep. 57.

Story, Confl. L. § 549.
See Ewer v. Coffin, I Cush. (Mass.) 24; S. C., 48 Am. Dec. 581; Rangely v. Webster, 11 N. H. 299; McVicker v. Beedy, 31 Mc. 317; S. C., 50 Am. Dec. 666; Phelps v. Holker, 1 Dall. (U. S.) 261; Kilburn v. Woodworth, 5 Johns. (N. Y.) 37; S. C., 4 Am. Dec. 321; Robinson v. Ward, 8 Johns. (N. Y.) 86; S. C., 5 Am. Dec. 327; Pawling v. Bird's Exrs., 13 Johns. (N. Y.) 192; Bissell v. Briggs, 9 Mass. 462; S. C., 6 Am. Dec. 88; 3 Burge Comm. on Col. & For. Law, pt. 2, ch. 24, pp. 1016-1019. Compare Taylor v. Phelps, 1 Harr. & G. (Md.) 492; Shumway v. Stillman, 6 Wend. (N. Y.) 447; Douglas v. Forrest, 4 Bing. 686-702-703; 1 Boullenols, obs. 25, pp. 609-610-619-620-622-623-624-628.

England, not only in rem, but also as to all the points and facts which are directly or incidentally decided; ¹⁴ but in the United States the rule is not uniform, some of the States holding that they are conclusive only in rem, and may be controverted as to all the incidental grounds and facts on which they profess to be founded, while others follow the English courts. ¹⁵

3. Judgments in Personam.—It is said that a sovereign is not bound jure gentium to execute any foreign judgment within his dominions, and that if execution of such an one is sought in his dominions, he is at liberty to examine into the merits of the judgment and refuse to give it effect where it appears unjust and unfounded. It is otherwise, however, where a foreign judgment is set up as a bar to an action. It

According to the doctrine of the American courts, where a judgment rendered by a foreign court in favor of the plaintiff is relied upon as a bar, it seems that if the foreign tribunal had no jurisdiction of the person of the defendant, a judgment there in favor of the plaintiff would not merge the original cause of action so as to defeat an action in another State upon the same cause. But if the court had full jurisdiction of the person of the defendant, a judgment for the plaintiff therein is a bar to a suit upon the original cause of action in another State of the Union. Do

The English courts, however, apply the rule even to cases where the court had full jurisdiction over the parties.²⁰

This distinction has been frequently recognized by the courts, and is regarded "as having a just foundation in international justice." ²¹

But according to the present doctrine in England when the plaintiff has recovered a judgment in a foreign country upon an original cause of action, he may sue either upon the judgment thus obtained or upon the original cause of action, the court there holding that such cause of action is not merged in the judgment thus obtained.²²

Whether the effect of a foreign judgment is a merger of this cause of action so as to defeat a recovery in another State upon the same cause of action, where the suits were commenced simultaneously, will depend upon the effect, force, and validity of such judgment in the State where rendered.²⁸

There was formerly a disposition among American courts to regard exparte judgments obtained on attachment of the debtor's property, and publication of notice, as not wholly void as to the person of the non-appearing defendant.²⁴ But the better opinion, and the one that prevails in the federal and State courts, seems to be that foreign judgment where the defendant did not appear and the

¹⁴ Blad v. Bamfield, 3 Swanst. 604; Tarleton v. M. & S. 20.

¹⁵ See Maley v. Shattuck, 3 Cr. (U. S.) 488; Gelston v. Hoyt, 3 Wheat. (U. S.) 246; Peters v. Warren Ins. Co., 3 Sumner C. C. 389; s. c., 1 Law Rep. 281; Andrews v. Herriot, 4 Cow. (N. Y.) 522 note; Vandenheuvel v. United Ins. Co., 2 Cain. Cas. (N. Y.) 217; Vandenheuvel v. United Ins. Co., 2 Johns. Cas. (N. Y.) 451; s. C., 1 Am. Dec. 180; Robinson v. Jones, 8 Mass. 536; s. C., 5 Am. Dec. 114; 2 Kent Comm. 120-121.

16 2 Kent Com. 119-120; Story, Conf. L., §§ 598-611-618; 1 Boullenois, obs. 25, p. 601.

¹⁷ Where a judgment has been pronounced by a competent court and carried into effect, the matter then becomes *res judicata*, and the losing party has no right to institute a new suit elsewhere for the litigation of the same question. 2 Kent Com. 119-120; Story, Conf. L. § 598.

Middlesex Bank v. Butman, 29 Me. 19; McVicker v. Beedy, 31 Me. 314; s. c., 50 Am. Dec. 666; Rangely v. Webster, 11 N. H. 299; Whittier v. Wendell, 7 N. H. 257; Kane v. Cook, 8 Cal. 449; Barnes v. Gibbs, 2 Vroom (N. J.), 317; Rogers v. Odell, 39 N. H. 457; North Bank v. Brown, 50 Me. 214; s. C., 79 Am. Dec. 409; Baxley v. Linah, 16 Pa. St. 241; s. C., 55 Am. Dec. 494.

¹⁹ See Bank of North America v. Wheeler, 28 Conn. 433; s. c., 73 Am. Dec. 683; Cleaves v. Lord, 43 Me.

290; Baxley v. Linah, 16 Pa. St. 241; s. C., 55 Am. Dec. 494; Child v. The Eureka Powder Works, 45 N. H. 547; North Bank v. Brown, 50 Me. 214; s. C., 69 Am. Dec. 609; Bank of United States v. Merchants' Bank, 7 Gill (Md.), 415; Curtiss v. Beardsley, 15 Conn. 523; McGilvray v. Avery, 30 Vt. 538.

20 Story, Conf. L. § 599b.

²¹ See Taylor v. Phelps, 1 Harr. & G. (Md.) 492; Griswold v. Pitcairn, 2 Conn. 85; Rangely v. Webster, 11 N. H. 299; Burnham v. Webster, 1 Wood & M. 174; Tarleton v. Tarleton, 4 M. & S. 20; Burrows v. Jemino, 2 Str. 733; S. C., Cas. T. Hard. 87; Boucher v. Lawson, Cas. T. Hard. 80; 2 Swanst. 326 n; Philips v. Hunter, 2 H. Black. 410; Erskine, Inst., B. 4. tit. 3, § 4; 2 Kent Com. 119-120; Story, Conf. L. § 598.

²² Bank of Australasia v. Harding, 9 C. B. 661; Bank of Australasia v. Nias, 16 Q. B. 717; Smith v. Nicolla, 5 Bing. (N. C.) 208-221-224; Hall v. Odber, 11 East, 118; Reimers v. Druce, 23 Beav. 149. If on an action in a foreign country a judgment in favor of the plaintiff does not merge the original cause therein, why should a judgment in favor of the defendant have that effect? See Story Conf. L. § 599α.

23 McGilvray v. Avery, 30 Vt. 53; Reed v. Girty, 6 Bosw. (N. Y.) 567.

²⁴ Mills v. Duryee, 7 Cr. (U. S.) 481; Hampton v. Mc-Connel, 3 Wheat. (U. S.) 234; Lapham v. Briggs, 27 Vt. 26; Bank of North America v. Wheeler, 28 Conn. 433; s. c., 73 Am. Dec. 683.

court had no jurisdiction over his person, are void.²⁵

4. Judgments in Courts of Sister States .-By the provisions of the federal constitution,26 it is required that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other State, and an act of Congress.27 Supplementary to the provisions of the constitution declares that the judgments of State courts shall have the same faith and credit in other States as they have in the State where they were rendered. It has accordingly been held that the decree or judgment in a court of competent jurisdiction of a sister State has the same credit, validity, and effect in the courts of another State that it has in the State where it was rendered; 28 but that the question of jurisdiction of the court rendering such judgment is always open,29 as is also the question of vitiating fraud.30

**D'Arcy v. Ketchum, 11 How.(U. S.) 165; Webster v. Reid, 11 How. (U. S.) 437; Hall v. Williams, 6 Pick. (Mass.) 232; s. c., 17 Am. Dec. 356; Kilburn v. Woodworth, 5 Johns. (N. Y.) 37; s. c., 4 Am. Dec. 321; Blssell v. Briggs, 9 Mass. 462; s. c., 6 Am. Dec. 88. Where A, of Vermont, sued B, of Vermont, and C, of Louisiana, in New Hampshire, and service was had by publication, and real estate attached, and defendants were defaulted without appearance, but the property attached did not satisfy the judgment, it was held, that the cause of action was not merged in the New Hampshire judgment so as to prelude A from maintaining a suit in Vermont upon the original cause of action. St. Johnsbury Bank v. Peabody, 55 Vt. 492; s. C., 45 Am. Rep. 632.

26 Article 3, 5 4.

MAct of Congress of May 26, 1790, ch. 11; Story on

Const. ch. 29, 55 1297-1307.

28 Pittsburg & St. L. R. R. Co. v. Rothschild (Pa.), 4 Cent. Rep. 109. See Phillips v. Godfrey, 7 Bosw. (N. Y.) 150; McFarland v. White, 13 La. Ann. 394; Barney v. Patterson, 6 Harr. & J. 182. Under United States constitution, article 4, section 1, and the Act of Congress of May 26, 1790, a writ of error, not operating as a supersedeas from the Supreme Appellate Court of Texas to a judgment of a district court of that State, will be regarded as having the same effect in Virginia as in Texas. Piedmont & Arlington Life Ins. Co. v. Ray, 75 Va. 821. If a scire facias would lie upon a judgment in the State in which it was rendered, an action of debt will lie upon it in another jurisdition. Simonton v. Barrell, 21 Wend. 362. And a judgment of a court of common pleas of a county in another State, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, is to be regarded as a judgment of a court of general jurisdiction, and is entitled to every presumption in favor of its validity and regularity. Pringle v. Woolworth, 90 N. Y. 502.

Pittsburg & St. L. R. R. Co. v. Rothchild (Pa.), 4

Cent. Rep. 109.

** See Gleason v. Dodd, 4 Metc. (Mass.) 333; Ewer v. Coffin, 1 Cush. (Mass.) 23; s. c., 48; Am. Dec. 587; Carleton v. Bickford, 18 Gray (Mass.), 591; s. c., 74

These provisions put such judgments on the same footing as domestic judgments; otherwise they would be regarded as foreign judgments.³¹

5. Judgment in Federal Courts.—The same rule applies to judgments of circuit courts of the United States, when relied upon in a State court, as governs the judgments of courts of sister States.³²

6. Judgments where Court had no Jurisdiction. — The United States constitution, requiring full faith an credit to be given in each State to the judicial proceedings of every other State, applies only where the court whose judgment is invoked had jurisdiction; and a finding or recital of such jurisdiction will not prevent inquiry; 33 and judgments rendered by the court of a foreign State without having acquired jurisdiction of the case and of the person of the defendant, are still to be regarded as foreign judgments when attempted to be enforced beyond the limits of the State when rendered. 34

Am. Dec. 652; Folger v. Columbian Ins. Co., 99 Mass. 273; Taylor v. Bryden, 8 Johns. (N. Y.) 73; Cummings v. Banks, 2 Barb. (N. Y.) 602; Davis v. Smith, 5 Ga. 274; s. C., 40 Am. Dec. 279; D'Arcy v. Ketchum, 11 How. (U. S.) 165; Pearce v. Olney, 20 Conn. 544; Rogers v. Gwinn, 21 Iowa, 58. However, there are numerous well-considered cases which deny the right to attack the judgment of a sister State on the ground of fraud. See Sanford v. Sanford, 28 Conn. 6, 28; McRae v. Mattoon, 13 Pick. (Mass.) 53; Bicknell v. Field, 8 Paige Ch. (N. Y.) 440; Christmas v. Russell, 72 U. S. (5 Wall.) 290; bk. 18 L. ed. 475.

³¹ See Dorsey v. Maury, 10 Smed. & M. 298; Seevers v. Clement, 28 Md. 426; Buckner v. Finley, 2 Pet. (U. S.) 586; Smith v. Lathrop, 44 Pa. St. 326.

22 See Barney v. Patterson, 6 Harr. & J. (Md.) 182; Niblett v. Scott, 4 La. Ann. 246.

Thompson v. Whitman, 18 Wall. (85 U. S.) 457; bk. 21 L. ed. 897; Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U. S. 714; bk. 24 L. ed. 565; Sewall v. Sewall, 122 Mass. 156; Kerr v. Kerr, 41 N. Y. 272; Hoffman v. Hoffman, 46 N. Y. 30.

34 D'Arcy v. Ketchum, 11 How. (U. S.) 165. Mr. Edmund H. Bennett criticises the doctrine of D'Arcy v. Ketchum, because, as he alleges, it "might seem to imply that the record when presented was liable to contradiction upon any question affecting the jurisdiction of the court." He adds: "But as no such doctrine has yet been declared by that court, we should hesitate to believe they will ever come to a result which we regard so much at variance with well established general principles. For in order to admit evidence to contradict the recitals of the record, we are obliged to adopt a rule of presumption precisely opposite to that which we apply in ordinary judgments; we have to make every possible presumption against their conclusiveness, and virtually treat them all as foreign judgments, until the contrary is established to the satisfaction of a jury. If this rule is to be generally recognized, there will be no judgment from any of the American States, when attempted to be enforced in

Thus, when the fact of divorce is sought to be proved by the record of a decree in another State, the decree may be questioned for want of jurisdiction apparent on the record.35 And it has been held that a decree for the removal of a cloud upon a title, being a decree in personam, can only be supported, against one not a citizen or resident of the State in which the decree is rendered, by actual service within the jurisdiction; hence, where such a decree is rendered by a State court against a non-resident upon a constructive service by publication, it is without jurisdiction, and affords no bar to a suit to recover the land brought in the federal court of the district embracing the State.36

7. Attacking Foreign Judgments.—Where a judgment is sought to be enforced in the courts of a sister State the defendant may not show that the judgment was founded on a mistake, either of law or of fact. The Neither will the fact that in the State where a foreign judgment is sought to be enforced the cause was barred by the statute of limitations when the suit upon which the judgment was obtained was brought, avail as a defense. And foreign judgment are said to be binding although proceedings are pending, but not decided, in the courts of the State where rendered to annul and set them aside. So

any other of the States where it will not be practicable by proper pleas to draw the validity of the whole judgment into controversy before the jury, and thus virtually nullify the provisions of the United States constitution and the acts of Congress in their favor. * * *

• We perceive no necessity for the adoption of any such rule of construction in regard to this class of judgments. All that is required to protect the rights of debtors or defendants in such cases, is to hold such judgments of no validity, unless acquiesced in by the defendant, until it appears by the record of such judgment that the court had jurisdiction both of the subject-matter and of the parties; and then treat the record as conclusive, the same as that of any domestic judgment." See Bennett's Edition of Story's Conf. L. 1599f.

85 Morey v. Morey, 27 Minn. 265.

** Hart v. Sansom, 110 U. S. 151; bk. 28 L. ed. 101.

⁸⁷ Hassell v. Hamilton, 33 Åla. 280; Rocco v. Hackett, 2 Bosw. (N. Y.) 579; Milne v. Van Buskirk, 9 Iowa, 558; Scott v. Pilkington, 2 B. & S. 11; Godard v. Gray, L. R. 6 Q. B. 139; Castrique v. Imrie, L. R. 4 H. L. 445.

445.

8 A State statute permitting such a defense has been held unconstitutional and void. Sweet v. Brackley, 53 Me. 346; Christmas v. Russell, 5 Wall. (72 U. S.) 290; bk. 18 L. ed. 475.

89 Gunn v. Howell, 35 Ala. 144; 8. C., 62 Am. Dec. 785; Indiana v. Helmer, 21 Iowa, 370; Barringer v. Boyd, 27 Miss. 473; Grover v. Grover, 30 Mo. 400; Merchants' Ins. Co. v. De Wolf, 33 Pa. St. 45; Scott v. Pilkington, 2 Best & S. 11.

8. Impeaching Record of Foreign Judgment,
—Whether a defendant who is sued upon a
foreign judgment may dispose a recital in
the record of personal service upon him, or
an appearance by an attorney, thereby denying the jurisdiction of the court rendering
the judgment, the cases are divided; some
hold that he can, 40 but the better opinion
seems to be that the averment in record of
personal service or appearance is conclusive
in other States. 41 And where the record
contains no averment of service or appearance, it is always open to the defendant to
show want of jurisdiction over his person. 42

9. Denying Authority of Attorney to Appear.—Where the record shows appearance by attorney only, the defendant, although he may not deny the fact of such appearance, the may deny that such attorney had any authority to appear.

10. Foreign Judgments Simply Evidence of Debt.—The judgments of courts of record in one State are entitled to recognition by the courts of sister States as evidence of a debt simply, 45 they have no extraterritorial force as judgments. 46 But as the original debt is not merged in a judgment rendered in a foreign court, such judgment may be as evidence by either party, in a suit on the original cause of action, without a formal allegation in the proceedings, and if it settles the

*0 See Starbuck v. Murray, 5 Wend. (N. Y.) 148; s. c., 21 Am. Dec. 172; Carleton v. Bickford, 13 Gray (Mass.), 591; s. c., 74 Am. Dec. 652; Rape v. Heaton, 9 Wis. 329; s. c., 76 Am. Dec. 269; Norwood v. Cobb, 24 Tex. 551.

⁴¹ See Welch v. Sykes, 3 Gilm. (III.) 197; s. C., 44 Am. Dec. 689; Lawrence v. Jarvis, 32 III. 304; Baltzell v. Nosler, 1 Clarke (Iowa), 588; Walker v. Lathrop, 6 Clarke (Iowa), 516; Westcott v. Brown, 13 Ind. 83; Wilcox v. Kassick, 2 Mich. 165; Wilson v. Jackson, 10 Mo. 330; Pritchett v. Clark, 3 Harr. (Del.) 241; Lincoln v. Tower, 2 McL. C. C. 473; Thompson v. Emmert, 4 McL. C. C. 96; Hampton v. McConnel, 3 Wheat. (U. S.) 234.

²³ Gunn v. Howell, 27 Ala. 663; S. C. 62 Am. Dec. 785; Nunn v. Sturges, 22 Ark. 389; Dunbar v. Hollowell, 34 Ill. 168; Pollard v. Baldwin, 22 Iowa, 328; Bissell v. Wheelock, 11 Cush. (Mass.) 277; Reid v. Boyd, 13 Tex. 241; S. C., 65 Am. Dec. 61; D'Arcy v. Ketchum, 11 How. (U. S.) 165.

6 Roberts v. Caldwell, 5 Dana (Ky.), 512; Gilbert v. Lane, 3 Porter, 267.

⁴⁴ Aldrich v. Kinney, 4 Conn. 380; s. C., 10 Am. Dec. 151; Lawrence v. Jarvis, 32 Ill. 304; Harshey v. Blackmarr, 20 Iowa, 161; Kerr v. Kerr, 41 N. Y. 272; Watson v. New England Bank, 4 Metc. (Mass.) 343; Shelton v. Tiffin, 6 How. (U. S.) 163.

4 Elizabethtown Savings Institution v. Gerber, 34 N. J. Eq. 130.

4 Id.

whole controversy between the parties, it is conclusive. 47

11. Priviliges and Priorities of Foreign Judgments.—Foreign judgments carry with them none of the priviliges or priorities that belong to them in the courts of the State where they are rendered, but only those which the lex fori gives to them as foreign judgments.⁴⁸

The constitution does not confer any new power upon the States, but simply regulates the effect of their acknowledged jurisdiction over persons and things within their own territory; ⁴⁹ it does not make the judgments of the courts of sister States domestic judgments to all intents and purposes, ⁵⁰ but simply gives a general validity, faith and credit to them as evidence, and no execution can issue upon them until after a new suit and judgment in the courts of the other States. ⁵¹

12. Tendency of Decisions to Restrict Foreign Judgments.—The tendency of recent decisions is to restrict the force of foreign judgments when they are relied upon as a cause of action in another State.⁵² The doctrine of the American courts in relation to

W New York, L. E. & W. Ry. Co. v. McHenry, 17 Fed.

Rep. 414.

Wood v. Watkinson, 17 Conn. 500; s. c., 44 Am. Dec. 562; McElmoyle v. Cohen, 13 Pet. (U.S.) 312-328-329; Story, Conf. L. §§ 582-609. Where a discharge in bankruptcy is a good defense to a judgment record subsequent to such discharge, but founded on a claim existing prior to the commencement of such bankruptcy proceedings, such discharge will be a good defense to an action on such judgment in another State, although the rule in the latter State regarding such judgments might be different. Haggerty v. Amory, 7 Allen (Mass.), 458. But such discharge will not be a defense where the rule in both States is that such discharge is no bar. Bradford v. Rice, 102 Mass. 472.

Shumway v. Stillman, 6 Wend. (N. Y.) 447; Harrod v. Barretto, 1 Hall (N. Y.), 55; s. C., 2 Hall (N. Y.), 302; Wilson v. Miles, 2 Hall (N. Y.), 358; Hall v. Williams, 6 Pick. (Mass.) 237; s. C., 17 Am. Dec. 256; Bissell v. Briggs, 9 Mass. 462; s. C., 6 Am. Dec. 88; Evans v. Tatem, 9 Serg. & R. (Pa.) 260; s. C., 11 Am. Dec. 717; Benton v. Burgot, 10 Serg. & R. (Pa.) 240; Hoxie v. Wright, 2 Vt. 263; Bellows v. ragham, 2 Vt. 576; Aldrich v. Kinney, 4 Conn. 380; s., 10 Am. Dec. 151.

80 See D'Arcy v. Ketchum, 11 How U. S.) 165.

a See Dimick v. Brooks, 21 Vt. 56°

See Arndt v. Arndt, 15 Ohio, 33; McVicker v. Beedy, 31 Me. 316; s. C., 50 Am. Dec. 666; Price v. Hickok, 39 Vt. 292; Moulin v. Insurance Co., 4 Zab. (N. J.) 222; Gillett v. Camp, 23 Mo. 375; Trimble v. Longworth, 13 Ohio St. 439; Smith v. Smith, 17 Ill. 482; Pollard v. Wegener, 13 Wis. 569; Jones v. Spencer, 15 Wis. 583; Ewer v. Coffin, 1 Cush. (Mass.) 23; s. C., 48 Am. Dec. 587; Foster v. Glazener, 27 Ala. 396.

foreign judgments seems now to be that they are only prima facie evidence of the facts therein recited regarding the jurisdiction of the court, 58 but are conclusive upon the merits, and can only be impeached for want of jurisdiction or fraud. 54

Such judgments are to be deemed right until the contrary is established. 55 If they are founded on frauds or pronounced by a court that has not acquired jurisdiction of the cause, they may be avoided. 56

13. Conclusiveness of Foreign Judgments.—
The question whether foreign judgments are to be deemed conclusive, or whether the defendant is at liberty to go at large into the original merits to show that the judgment ought to have been different upon the merits, although obtained bona fide, has been much discussed in England. 57

58 See Carleton v. Bickford, 18 Gray (Mass.), 591; s. C., 74 Am. Dec. 652; Bodurtha v. Goodrich, 3 Gray (Mass.), 108; Silver Lake Bank v. Harding, 5 Ohio, 545; Indiana v. Helmer, 21 Iowa, 370; Lewis v. Wilder, 4 La. Ann. 574; Bissell v. Briggs, 9 Mass. 462; s. c., 6 Am. Dec. 88; Borden v. Fitch, 15 Johns. (N. Y.) 121; s. c., 8 Am. Dec. 225; Green v. Sormelnto, 1 Pet. C. C. 74; Field v. Gibbs, 1 Pet. C. C. 155; Aldrich v. Kinney, 4 Conn. 380; s. c., 10 Am. Dec. 151; Shumway v. Stillman, 6 Wend. (N. Y.) 447; Hall v. Williams, 6 Pick. (Mass.) 247; S. C., 17 Am. Dec. 356; Starbuck v. Murray, 5 Wend. (N. Y.) 148; s. c., 21 Am Dec. 172; Davis v. Peckard, 6 Wend. (N. Y.) 327; Buttrick v. Allen, 8 Mass. 273; S. C., 5 Am. Dec. 105; Pawling v. Bird's Exrs., 13 Johns. (N. Y.) 192; Rathbone v. Terry, 1 R. I. 78; Hitchcock v. Aicken, 1 Caine (N. Y.), 460; Hoxie v. Wright, 2 Vt. 263; Bellows v. Ingham, 2 Vt. 575; Barnes v. Patterson, 6 Harr. & J. (Md.) 182; Andrews v. Herriot, 4 Cow. (N. Y.), 520 n.; 2 Kent Com. 118. But this rule does not seem to have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States. See Landes v. Brant, 10 How. (U. S.) 348.

54 See Cummings v. Banks, 2 Barb. (N. Y.) 602; Noyes v. Butler, 6 Barb. (N. Y.) 613; Lazier v. Westcott, 26 N. Y. 152; Monroe v. Douglas, 4 Sandf. Ch. (N. Y.) 126. Compare Rankin v. Goddard, 54 Me. 28; Wood v. Watkinson, 17 Conn. 500; s. C., 44 Am. Dec. 562; Welch v. Sykes, 3 Gilm. (Ill.) 197; s. C., 44 Am. Dec. 689.

8 Monroe v. Douglas, 4 Sandf. Ch. (N. Y.) 126; Ripple v. Ripple, 1 Rawle (Pa.), 386; Hall v. Odber, 11 East, 118; Alivon v. Furnival, 1 Cromp. M. & R. 277; Price v. Dewhurst, 8 Sim. 279; Houlditch v. Donegal, 2 Clark & Finn. 470; Arnott v. Redfern, 3 Bing. 353; Sinclair v. Fraser, Doug. 4-5 n.; Walker v. Witter, Doug. 1.

See Don v. Lippmann, 5 Clark & Finn. 1-19-20-21; Ferguson v. Mahon, 11 Ad. & E. 179-182; Price v. Dewhurst, 8 Sim. 279-302; Ferguson v. Mahon, 3 Per. Dav. 143; Bowles v. Orr, 1 Younge & C. 464; Story Conf. L., §§ 544-545-560-602.

57 See Kennedy v. Earl of Cassillis, 2 Swanst. 326-327, n.; Boucher v. Lawson, Cas. T. Hard, 89; Roach v. Garvan, 1 Ves. 157; Walker v. Witter, Doug. 1-6, n. 3; Herbert v. Cook, Willes, 38, n.; Hall v. Odber, 11 Ea But the doctrine may be said to be now well established that a foreign judgment is only prima facie evidence upon the question whether the foreign court had jurisdiction of the subject-matter or the person of the defendant, or whether the judgment was regulary obtained; but that it is so far conclusive upon the defendant or to prevent him from denying that the promises upon which it was founded were ever made, or alleging that they were obtained by fraud of the plaintiff. It is also said that the pleas which might have been filed to the original action cannot be pleaded to an action upon the judgment. ⁵⁸

14. Pending of Suit in Another State.—It seems that the pendency of a suit in a foreign court cannot be set up as a defense in a subsequent suit.⁵⁹ And each State in the Union, being foreign to every other except as united for national purposes under the constitution,⁶⁰ in this respect they are foreign countries, so that the mere pendency of a suit in the courts of another State cannot be pleaded in abatement.⁶¹

It is said that the rule that the judgment is to be prima facie evidence would be a mere delusion if the defendant were permitted to question it by opening all or any of the original merits on his side which under such cir-118; Bayley v. Edwards, 3 Swanst. 703-711-712; Philips v. Hunter, 2 H. Black. 410; Galbraith v. Neville, Doug. 6, n. 3; Sinclair v. Fraser, Doug. 4-5, n. 1; Allvon v. Furnival, 1 Cromp. M. & R. 277; Guinness v. Carroll, 1 Barn. & Ad. 459; Becquet v. McCarthy, 2 Barn. & Ad. 951; Tarleton v. Tarleton, 4 Maule & S. 21; Martin v. Nicolls, 3 Sim. 458; Bank of Australasia v. Harding, 19 Law Jour. C. P. 345; s. c., 9 C. B. 661; Houlditch v. Donegal, 8 Bligh, 301-340; Henderson v. Henderson. 3 Hare, 100-113-115.

88 See Bank of Australasia v. Nias, 16 Q. B. 717; s. c., 4 Eng. L. & Eq. 252; Hendrson v. Henderson, 6 Q. B. 288; Reimers v. Druce, 23 Beav. 149; De Cosse Brissae v. Rathbone, 6 H. & N. 301; Vanquelin v. Bouard, 15 C. B. (N. S.) 341; Ricardo v. Garcias, 12 Clark & Finn. 368; Scott v. Pilkington, 2 Q. & S. 11; Crawley v. Isaacs, 16 L. T. (N. S.) 529; Vallee v. Dumergue, 4 Exch. 290; Cowan v. Braidwood, 2 Scott, N. R. 138; Doglioni v. Crispin, L. R. 1 H. L. 301.

59 Scott v. Seymour, 1 Hurls. & C. 219; Cox v. Mitchell, 7 C. B. (N. S.) 55; Ostell v. Lepage, 5 De Gex & S. 95; S. C., 10 Eng. L. & Eq. 255; Bayley v. Edwards, 3 Swanst. 703; Maule v. Murray, 7 T. R. 470; Russell v. Field, Stewart's Canada, 558.

60 Buckner v. Finley & Van Lear. 2 Pet. 586.

al Bowne v. Joy, 9 Johns. (N. Y.) 221; Salmon v. Wooton, 9 Dana (Ky.), 423; McJulton v. Love, 13 Ill.
486; s. c., 54 Am. Dec. 449; Drake v. Brander, 8 Tex.
352; Seevers v. Clement, 28 Md. 434; Smith v. Lathrop,
44 Pa. St. 326; Hatch v. Spofford, 22 Conn. 485; s. c.,
58 Am. Dec. 433; Goodall v. Marshall, 11 N. H. 99; s.
c., 35 Am. Dec. 472; Cook v. Litchfield, 5 Sanf. (N. Y.)
842.

cumstances would be equivalent to granting a new trial; that the defendant may impeach the original judgment by showing that the court had no jurisdiction; that he never had notice of suit, that the judgment was procured by fraud, that upon its face it is founded upon mistake, or that it is irregular and bad by the local law, but that beyond this he cannot impugn the judgment. 62

But it seems that where a debtor has been sued by his creditor in one State, such suit will be a bar in a suit in another State by a person having a claim against such creditor, seeking to hold the debtor as a trustee. The same rule applies to actions in the federal and State courts. 44

The same rule applies to a suit pending in a United States court for a different district than the one in which the State in which the second action is instituted is situated, 65 and vice versa. 66 Otherwise, however, where the first action is pending in the United States circuit court in which the State in which the second action is brought is situated, provided the circuit court has jurisdiction of the cause. 67

But where one of the actions is at law and the other is in equity neither will be cause for abatement.⁶⁸

© See Ferguson v. Mahon, 11 Ad. & El. 179-182; Arnott v. Redfern, 2 Carr. & P. 88; s. c., 3 Bing. 353; Novelli v. Rossi, 2 Barn. & Ad. 757; Douglas v. Forrest, 4 Bing. 686; Obicini v. Bligh, 8 Bing. 335; Martin v. Nicolls, 3 Sim. 458; Alivon v. Furnival, 1 Cromp. M. & R. 277; Starkie, Ev. pt. 2, § 67; Huberus, Tom. 2 Lib. 1, tit. 3, de Conflictu, § 6.

68 Merrill v. New England Ins. Co., 103 Mass. 249; Whipple v. Robbins, 97 Mass. 107; American Bank v. Rollins, 99 Mass. 313.

64 Freeman v. Howe, 24 How. (65 U. S.) 450; bk. 16 L. ed. 749.

& Walsh v. Durkin, 12 Johns. (N. Y.) 99; Cook v. Litchfield, 5 Sandf. (N. Y.) 330.

% White v. Whitman, 1 Curt. C. C. 494; Lyman v. Brown, 2 Curt. C. C. 559.

67 Smith v. Atlantic Mut. Fire Ins. Co., 2 Foster (N.

H.), 21.

66 Hatch v. Spofford, 22 Conn. 485; s. c., 58 Am. Dec. 433; Colt v. Partridge, 7 Met. (Mass.) 370. And the same is true where both actions are at law if the parties be reversed. Wadleigh v. Veazie, 3 Summer C. C. 165.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION — STREET IM-PROVEMENTS — NEGLIGENCE OF CON-TRACTOR — RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR — CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE — WHAT IS NOTICE.

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM V. MCCRARY.

Supreme Court of Alabama, July 10, 1888.

1. Municipal Corporation—Street Improvements—Negligence of Contractor—Respondent Superior.—When a municipal corporation lets a contract to improve its streets, and the contract directly requires the performance of a work intrinsically dangerous, or when the corporation is bound to keep its streets free from defect, it is liable to a party injured by negligence of the contractor, though it did nothing except to locate and accept the work; in such case the principle of respondent superior applies.

2. Same—Contributory Negligence—A Question for the Jury.—In an action against a city for damages caused from the alleged negligence of the corporate authorities in allowing a ditch made across a sidewalk, incident to the construction of a sewer, to be open during the night-time without lights or other suitable protection, in consequence of which the plaintiff fell in and broke his arm: Held, that whether there was contributory negligence or not on the part of the injured party, was not a question of law, but one of fact, to be passed on by the jury.

3. Same—What is Notice.—In cases of this nature, special notice to the city of the dangerous condition of the street where the improvement is being made, is not necessary to hold the municipal corporation liable for injuries. The city is charged with notice when the work is being done by its expressed authority, in a measure, under the eye of its engineer, and necessarily dangerous in its nature.

SOMERVILLE, J., delivered the opinion of the

The present action is based upon the alleged negligence of the corporate authorities of the city of Birmingham in allowing a ditch or excavation made across a sidewalk, incident to the construction of a sewer, to remain open during the nighttime, without covering, guards, or lights, in consequence of which the plaintiff fell in, and was injured by the breaking of his arm. The main defense relied on by the city is that the wrong act complained of was the act of one Stonestreet. to whom the city had lawfully let the contract of constructing the sewers, and that, under the terms of the contract, Stonestreet was an independent contractor, and, as such, was alone liable to the plaintiff for the damages claimed, if any one was so liable. Contributory negligence on the part of the plaintiff, and want of notice of the defect or excavation in the street, were also relied on by the defendant. The contract between the city and Stonestreet provided that the work was to be done according to certain plans and specifications, and under the supervision of the city engineer, so far as to make it his duty to inspect the laying of the sewer-pipes, and to accept and receive the work when completed; but neither the engineer, nor other city officers, had anything to do with the employment or direction of the hands, or of superintending the work while it was in progress, except that it was the engineer's duty to lay out the work, set the stakes fixing the depth the sewer-pipes were to be laid, and to see that they were laid at proper depth or grade.

The general rule is well settled, and not denied by appellee's counsel, that one person is not ordinarily liable for any injury produced by the negligence of another, unless the relation of master and servant exists between them; and that where such injury is done by an independent contractor. or one who reserves the general control over the work, with the right to direct what shall be done. and the manner of doing it, the quasi employer or contractee cannot be held liable for an injury resulting from the negligence of such contractor, or of his servants, and collaterally to the work contracted to be done, such work not being a nuisance per se. In all such cases the rule respondent superior applies. Wood. Mast. & Serv. (2d Ed.) p. 603, § 314 et seq.; Id. p. 598, § 313; Cuff v. Railroad Co., 35 N. J. Law, 17, 10 Amer. Rep. 205. But there are two established classes of exceptions to which this general rule had no application. It does not apply (1) where the work contracted to be performed will, in its progress, however skilfully done, be necessarily or intrinsically dangerous; and (2) where the law imposes on the employer the duty to keep the subject of the work in a safe condition.

The first exception applies where the obstruction or defect which produced the injury results directly and necessarily from the acts which the contractor agreed and was authorized to do; the person authorizing and the person authorized each being equally liable to the injured party, the relation of principal and agent, pro hac vice at least, existing between them, notwithstanding the employment may in other respects be independent. "It would be monstrous," said Lord Campbell, in Ellis v. Gas Co., 2 El. & Bl. 767, "if the party causing another to do a thing were exempted from liability for that act merely because there was a contract between him and the person immediately causing the act to be done." The rule is said by Mr. Justice Clifford, in Water Co. v. Ware, 16 Wall. 566, to be based on common justice, that, "if the contractor does the thing which he is employed to do, the employer is as responsible for the thing as if he had done it himself; but if the act which is the subject of complaint is purely collateral to the matter contracted to be done, and arises indirectly in the course of the performance of the work, the employer is not liable, because he never authorized the work [act] to be done." It is observed by Mr. Dillon, in his work on Municipal Corporations, that while the principal of respondeat superior does not generally extend to cases of independent contracts, where the party for whom the contract is to be done is not the immediate superior of those guilty of the wrongful act, and has no choice in the selection of the workmen, and no control over the manner

of doing the work, it is important to bear in mind that this general rule "does not apply where the contract directly requires the performace of a work intrinsically dangerous, however skillfully performed." "In such a case," he adds, "the party authorizing the work is justly regarded as the author of the mischief resulting from it, whether he does the work himself, or lets it out by contract." 2 Dill. Mun. Corp. (3d Ed.) § 1029. A fair illustration of this principle is found in the case of City of Joliet v. Harwood, 86 Ill. 110, 29 Amer. Rep. 17, where a city employing a contractor to construct a sewer, where the work necessarily involved the blasting of rock, was held liable for the damage resulting from a rock thrown by the blast against the plaintiff's house. The right of recovery was held not to rest on the charge of negligence by the contractor, who used all proper diligence in his work, but upon the fact that "the city caused work to be done which was intrinsically dangerous, the natural, though not the necessary, consequence of which was the injury to plaintiff's property." So, in the case of McCafferty v. Railroad Co., 61 N. Y. 178, we have an example of the principle that there is no liability where the injury is collateral to the work done by an independent contractor, and not a necessary result of its execution. There a railroad company lawfully let the work of constructing its road to a contractor, who sublet a part of the work to others. The employees of a subcontractor, by negligently overcharging a blast of powder, caused rocks to be thrown against the plaintiff's premises, resulting in the damage complained of in the action. The railroad company was held not to be responsible. In cases of this kind it has been held that the injury is presumed to be a necessary incident of doing the work, unless the defendant shows that it resulted from some act of negligence on the part of the contractor or his servants. Sabin v. Railroad Co., 25 Vt. 363. Mr. Wood, in his work on Master and Servant, thus formulates the principle: "When the work cannot be done at all, in the ordinary modes of executing it, without producing injury and damage, the contractor is liable; but when the injury and damage result simply from the careless or improper mode of executing the work, and the contractee has been guilty of no negligence in selecting a contractor, there is no principle of law which casts upon the contractee the burden of responsibility;" "and," he adds, "a contrary doctrine would be disastrous in its consequences, and serve seriously to embarrass and retard the proper use and healthy development of property, and the growth of cities and towns." Wood, Mast. & Serv. p. 609 et seq.; Id. p. 603, § 314. Such is the rule governing the first class of excepted cases above enumerated, where the work contracted to be performed is intrinsically dangerous, or arises from the very nature of the improvement, which is said by Mr. Dillion to be applicable to work done by independent contractors, according to the later and better consid-

ered cases in this country. This doctrine he states to be that, "where the work contracted for necessarily constitutes an obstruction or defect in the street, of such a nature as to render it unsafe or dangerous for the purpose of public travel unless properly guarded or protected, the employer (equally with the contractor), where the injury results directly from the acts which the contractor engaged to perform, is liable therefor to the injured party. But the employer is not liable where the obstruction or defect in the street, causing the injury, is wholly collateral to the contract work, and entirely the result of the negligence or wrongful acts of the contractor, subcontractor, or his servants. In such a case, the immediate author of the injury is alone liable." 2 Dill. Mun. Corp. (3d Ed.) § 1030. The rule, as thus carefully formulated by Judge Dillon, is fully supported by the adjudged cases, at least in the American courts; and seems to us to be correct one. Wilson v. City of Wheeling, 19 W. Va. 323, 42 Amer. Rep. 780; City of Erie v. Caulkins, 27 Amer. Rep. 647, note; Storrs v. City of Utica, 17 N. Y. 104, 72 Amer. Dec. 437, and note, 441; Sulzbacher v. Dickie, 51 How. Pr. 500.

The second class of excepted cases, or those where the law imposes on the employer the duty to keep the subject of the work in safe condition, especially include those municipal corporations upon which the duty is imposed, directly or impliedly, by statute, to keep their streets in a safe condition for the traveling public. It is not denied that the charter of the city of Birmingham devolves upon it this obligation, impliedly at least, as a necessary result from the corporate powers given and the corporate duties imposed. Acts 1880-81, pp. 471, 480, § 20; Albrittin v. Mayor, etc., 60 Ala. 486, 31 Amer. Rep. 46; City Council v. Wright, 72 Ala. 411. This fact brings the case within the rule under consideration. which is quite distinct from the last rule above discussed by us. It depends on the principle that, where the statute thus imposes a duty upon a corporation, its faithful discharge cannot be evaded by any effort to cast this duty on another by contract or otherwise. This the law will not permit, nor can liability for damages resulting from the neglect of such duty be avoided in any such way. "Therefore, according to the better view," says Mr. Dillion, "where a dangerous excavation is made, and negligently left open (without proper lights, guards, or coverings), in a traveled street or sidewalk, by a contractor under the corporation for building a sewer or other improvements, the corporation is liable to a person injured thereby, although it may have had no immediate control over the workmen, and had even stipulated in the contract that proper precautions should be taken by the contractor for the protection of the public, and making him liable for accidents occasioned by his neglect." 2 Dill. Mun. Corp. (3d ed.) § 1027. There is a general consensus of authority in support of this view; the case on the subject being that of Storrs v. City of

Utica, supra, decided by the New York court of appeals in 1858. That case, like this, was based on the negligence of the city in allowing an excavation in the street, made in the construction of a sewer, to remain open and unguarded during the night-time, in consequence of which the plaintiff fell in and was hurt. The city was held liable apparently on each of the grounds above discussed. "The cause of the accident," said Judge Comstock, "was not in the manner in which the work was carried on by the laborers. If it had been, their immediate employer, and he only, was liable for the injury." "But," he continues, "in a sense strictly logical, as it seems to me, the accident was the result of the work itself, however skilfully performed. A ditch cannot be dug in a public street, and left open and unguarded at night, without imminent danger of such casualties. If they do occur, who is the author of the mischief? Is it not be who causes the ditch to be dug, whether he does it with his own hands, employes laborers, or lets it out by contract? If by contract, then I admit that the contractor must respond to third parties if his servants or laborers are negligent in the immediate execution of the work. But the ultimate superior or proprietor first determines that the excavation shall be made, and then he selects his own contractor. Can he escape responsibility for putting a public street in a condition dangerous for travel at night, by interposing the contract which he himself has made for the very thing which creates the danger? I should answer this question in the negative." In the same case, this principle is applied to a municipal corporation which owes to the public the duty of keeping the street in a safe condition for travel; and the proposition is asserted that this duty cannot be thrown off or devolved on another who contracts for the construction of sewers or other improvements in the public streets. "Although," it is said, "the work may be let out by contract, the corporation still remains charged with the care and control of the street in which the improvement is carried on. The performance of the work necessarily renders the street unsafe for night travel. This is a result which does not at all depend on the care or negligence of the laborer employed by the contractor. The danger arises from the very nature of the improvement; and if it can be averted only by special precautions, such as placing guards or lighting the street, the corporation which has authorized the work is plainly bound to take these precautions. The contractor may very probably be bound by agreement, not only to construct the sewer, but also to do such other acts as may be necessary to protect travel. But a municipal corporation," he concludes, "cannot, I think, in this way, either avoid indictment in behalf of the public, or its liability to individuals who are injured." Storrs v. City of Utica, 72 Amer. Dec. 437, 440. We make no apology for quoting so much at length from this case, where the subject under consideration is so ably and learnedly dis-

cussed. That case is strictly analogous to the one in hand, and has been followed by the United States Supreme Court, as well as by nearly all of the State courts, except in Pennsylvania, and a single case in Missouri, which seems, however, to have been impliedly overruled by a later decision in the same State. Blake v. St. Louis, 40 Mo. 569; Barry v. St Louis, 17 Mo. 121; Painter v. Mayor, 46 Pa. St. 213. The decisions of these States, relied on in the argument of this cause by the appellant's counsel, have been generally condemned in this country, and we are unwilling to follow them. Storrs v. City of Utica, 72 Amer. Dec. 437, note, 441, and cases cited; City of Erie v. Caulkins, 85 Pa. St. 247, 27 Amer. Rep. 642, and note, 647-650; Robbins v. Chicago, 4 Wall. 657; Chicago v. Robbins, 2 Black, 418; Water Co. v. Ware, 16 Wall. 566; City of Springfield v. Le Claire, 49 Ill. 476; City of Detroit v. Corey, 9 Mich. 165; Circleville v. Neuding, 41 Ohio St. 465; City of St. Paul v. Seitz, 3 Minn. 297 (Gil. 205); Nashville v. Brown, 9 Heisk. 1, 24 Amer. Rep. 289; Wilson v. City of Wheeling, 19 W. Va. 323, 42 Amer. Rep. 780; Mayor, etc., v. O'Donnell, 53 Md. 110, 36 Amer. Rep. 395; City of Logansport v. Dick, 70 Ind. 65, 36 Amer. Rep. 166; City of Buffalo v. Holloway, 57 Amer. Dec. 550; 2 Dill. Mun. Corp. (3d Ed.) §§ 1027, 1029, 1030; Wood, Mast. & Serv. (2d Ed.) p. 616, § 316.

The city court substantially conformed its rulings to the foregoing principles. The excavation made across the sidewalk of the city, in the process of constructing the sewer, was made by the express authority of the city in the exercise of a purely ministerial power. Stonestreet, notwithstanding the general independent nature of his employment as a contractor, was a quasi agent of the municipal authorities for this purpose. If he had been indicted for creating a nuisance, he could only have defended under the right conferred by them, and as their agent pro hac vice. City of Detroit v. Corey, 9 Mich. 164; Nashville v. Brown, 24 Amer. Rep. 289. The excavation was one which in its nature would be intrinsically or necessarily accompanied with danger to pedestrians if left uncovered or unguarded, and without proper lights, in the night-time. The duty of the city, imposed by its charter, was to see to it that its sidewalks were kept in a reasonably safe condition for ordinary use by the public. This duty it could not escape by letting out the work to a contractor. The authorities should have seen to it that the contractor performed his duty; and for this act of negligence they are liable for any injury and damages proximately resulting from it, to which the plaintiff did not contribute by his want of ordinary care. The court, in effect, so charged. In cases of this nature, it is manifest that special notice to the city of the dangerous condition of the street where the excavation is made, is not a prerequisite to liability. The work being done by the express authority of the city, and, in a measure, under the eye of its engineer, and necessarily dangerous in its nature, the municipal authorities are charged with notice of its existence. Brusso v. City of Buffalo, 90 N. Y. 679; City of Springfield v. Le Claire, 49 Ill. 477. There is a class of cases where the liability of the city is made to depend on its negligence to keep its streets in repair, and the question of negligence is dependent on notice to the city of the existence of some defect or obstruction causing the injury. But where an agent or quisa agent of the city creates the defect by an authorized act. as here, the law imputes notice to the employer. 2 Dill. Mun. Corp. (3d ed.) § 1025, note 1. In this case different conclusions may well and reasonably have been drawn, from the evidence, on the question of contributory negligence vel non on the part of the plaintiff; and for this reason the court properly submitted this inquiry to the jury, and declined to determine it as a matter of law. City Council v. Wright, 72 Ala. 411; Eureka Co. v. Bass, 81 Ala. 200, 60 Amer. Rep. 152.

We find no error in any of the rulings of the court, and the judgment is affirmed.

NOTE.-General Rule-Respondent Superior .- It is well settled that one person is not liable for the negligence of another, except the relation of master and servant exists between them. When an injury is done by an independent contractor, or his servants, with the right to direct what shall be done, and the manner of doing it, he is liable for the damages resulting from his negligence, and collaterally to the work contracted to be done, such work not being a nuisance per se. Respondent superior applies in such cases. But the principle of respondent superior does not apply where the party for whom the work is to be done is not the immediate superior, and has no choice in the selection of the servants, and no control over the manner of doing the work.1

Exceptions to the General Rule .- 1. The general rule does not apply where the contract directly requires the performance of a work intrinsically and necessarily dangerous, although the contractor uses the most skilful method in its prosecution. Under this condition the city or party authorizing the work is considered the author of the injury resulting from it, whether he does the work himself, or lets it out by contract. The person authorizing and the person au-

¹ Erie v. Caulkins, 85 Pa. St. 247; s. c., 27 Am. Rep. 642; Harrison v. Collins, 86 Pa. St. 153; Painter v. Mayor, 46 Pa. St. 213; Cuff v. Newark, 35 N. J. L. 17; s. c., 10 Am. Rep. 205; Scammon v. Chicago, 25 Ill. 424; Blake v. Ferris, 1 Seld. (N. Y.) 48; King v. Railroad Co., 66 N. Y. 181; Storrs v. Utica, 17 N. Y. 104; Cincinnati v. Stone, 5 Ohio St. 38; Hilliard v. Richardson, 3 Gray (Mass.), 349; Harper v. Milwaukee, 30 Wis. 365; Wood Mast. & Serv. (2d ed.) p. 603, § 314, et seq.; Water Co. v. Ware, 16 Wall, 566; Croft v. Alison, 4 B. & Ald. 590; Wright v. Wilcox, 19 Wend. 343; Johnson v. Friel, 50 N. Y. 679; McCafferty v. Railroad Co., 61 N. Y. 178; Butler v. Hunter, 7 Hurl. & N. 826; Allen v. Willard, 57 Pa. St. 374; McGuire v. Grant, 1 Dutch. (N. J. L.) 356; Steele v. Railroad Co., 16 C. B. 550; Rapson v. Cubit, 9 M. & W. 710; Holmes v. Railroad Co., L. R., 4 Exch. 254; Gillis v. Railroad Co., 8 Am. Law Reg. (N. S.) 729; Smith v. Dock Co., L. R., 3 C. P. 326; Knight v. Fox, 5 Exch. 721; Overton v. Freeman, 11 C. B. 867; Plymouth Coal Co. v. Kommisky, 116 Pa. St. 365; Haxamer v. Webb, 101 N. Y. 377; s. c., 57 Am. Rep. 703; Edmudson v. Railroad Co., 111 Pa. St. 316; Rankin v. Transportation Co., 73 Ga. 229; Hitte v. Railroad Co., 19 Neb. 620; Bennett v. Truebody, 66 Cal. 509; Matthes v. Kerrigan, 53 N. Y. Super. Ct. 431.

thorized, are both equally liable to the injured party, the relation of principal and agent, pro hac vice at least, existing between them.2

In the case of Joliet v. Harwood,3 it is held that the principle of respondent superior does not extend to cases of independent contracts, where the party for whom the work is being done is not the immediate superior to those causing the injury, and has no control over the manner of doing the work; that the rule is otherwise where the work is dangerous in itself, no matter how skilfully done. Thus, if a city employs a contractor to blast a rock in a street for a sewer, and he uses all due care, and damages result to another from a stone thrown by the blasting, the city will be liable in damages for the injury.4

But the city is not liable where the defect in the street, causing the injury, is wholly collateral to the work and entirely the result of the negligence or wrongful act of the contractor or his servants.

In the case of McCafferty v. Railroad Co.,6 a railroad company let by contract the entire work of building its track. The contractor sublet a portion of the work; the servants of the subcontractor, in performing the work, by a blast threw stones and rocks upon the plaintiff's premises, injuring it: Held, the railroad company was not liable. It was also held that Hay v. Cohoes County? was not applicable to the question involved in this case.

2. Where the duty is imposed upon a city to keep its streets in a safe condition for use of the public, it cannot shift this obligation to a person who had been employed to improve the streets, and if an injury results from neglect of such duty, the corporation may be held liable for the injury. Where the charter or statute imposes a duty upon a city, its faithful discharge cannot be evaded by any effort to cast this duty on another by contract or otherwise.8

² Tiffin v. McCormick, 34 Ohio St. 638; Stone v. Railroad Co., 19 N. H. 427; Lowell v. Railroad Co., 23 Pick. 24; Carman v. Railroad Co., 4 Ohio St. 339; Fay v. Davidson, 13 Minn. 523; Savannah v. Waldner, 49 Ga. 316; Blake v. St. Louis, 40 Mo. 569; Murphy v. Lowell, 124 Mass. 564; Wright v. Halbrook, 52 N. H. 120; Harrisburg v. Saylor, 87 Pa. St. 216; Joliet v. Harwood, 86 Ill. 110; Whitney v. Clifford, 46 Wis. 138; Turner v. Newburg (N. Y.), 16 N. E. Rep. 314; Klein v. Dallas (Tex.), 8 S. W. Rep. 90; Chapman v. Milton (W. Va.), 7 S. E. Rep. 22. 8 86 Til. 110.

4 Shearman & Redfield on Neg., § 142; Pfau v. Williamson, 63 Ill. 16; Kelly v. Mayor, 11 N. Y. 482; St. Paul v. Letz, 3 Minn. 297.

5 Wilson v. Wheeling, 19 W. Va. 323; Robbins v. Chicago, 4 Wall. 657; Sulzbacher v. Dickie, 51 How. Pr. 500; Nashville v. Brown, 9 Heisk. (Tenn.) 1; Erie v. Caulkins, 85 Pa. St. 247; S. C., 27 Am. Rep. 647, and note; Storrs v. Utica, 17 N. Y. 104; S. C., 72 Am. Rep. 437, and note; Kelly v. Mayor, 11 N. Y. 432; Cincinnati v. Stone, 5 Ohio St. 38; Goudier v. Cormack, 2 E. D. Smith (N. Y.), 254; Detroit v. Corey, 9 Mich. 165; Springfield v. Le Claire, 49 Ill. 476; Palmer v. Lincoln, 5 Neb. 136. 661 N. Y. 178.

7 2 N. Y. 159.

8 Circleville v. Neuding, 41 Ohio St. 465; Storrs v. Utica, 17 N. Y. 104; Mayor v. O'Donnell, 53 Md. 110; Buffalo v. Halloway, 3 Seld. (N. Y.) 493; Robbins v. Chicago, 2 Black. (U. S.) 418; City Council v. Wright, 72 Ala. 411; Logansport v. Dick, 70 Ind. 65; Detroit v. Corey, 9 Mich. 165; Hincks v. Milwaukee, 46 Wis. 559; Butler v. Bangor, 67 Mc. 385; Blake v. St. Louis, 40 Mo. 569; Baltimore v. Pennington, 15 Md. 385; Nashville v. Brown, 9 Heisk. (Tenn.) I; Watson v. Tripp, II R. I. 98; Mayor v. Railroad Co., 49 N. Y. 657. Compare Painter v. Pittsburg, 46 Pa. St. 221; Barry v. St. Louis, 17 Mo. 121; Westchester v. Apple, 35 Pa. St. 224; Erie v. Caulkins, 55 Pa. St. 247. In an action against a city for injuries alleged to have been sustained by the plaintiff from falling into a sewer, which work was let out to a contractor, the defendant sought to avoid liability on two grounds:

1. The contractor was the only party liable. 2. The charter provided that the city should not be liable for any damages arising from the bad condition of its streets, from neglect to repair the same, until a certain officer should have been notified thereof and failed to repair the same within a reasonable time: Held, that neither plea presented any defense to the action; that the provision in the charter had no application to the case stated; that in permitting the sewer to be constructed in a dangerous manner was the cause of the injury, and the city was liable.

9

Contributory Negligence of the Plaintiff a Question for the Jury.—When different conclusions may well and reasonably have been made from the evidence, on the question of contributory negligence of the plaintiff, the court will not decide the question as a matter of law, but will submit it to the jury as a matter of fact. If the facts are not controverted, yet if there is a reasonable ground for different conclusions, the jury is to decide as to the contributory negligence of the plaintiff. This is a question for the jury in all cases except where the facts are undisputed, and the inference to be deduced from them is clear and certain.¹⁰

When the facts are undisputed, and but one inference can be deduced in regard to the case of the plaintiff, it is a question of law for the determination of the court. II

Sometimes the question of contributory negligence is a mixed question of law and fact.¹³ It is the duty of the court to tell the jury what facts, if proved, will constitute contributory negligence, and explain the rule of proximate cause.¹⁵ When the court has thus instructed the jury, they must determine the facts and then apply the law as laid down.¹⁴

What is Sufficient Notice to the City.—In the principal case it is laid down that where the liability of the

9 Springfield v. LeClaire, 49 Ill. 476.

10 Railroad Co. v. Stout, 17 Wall. (U. S.) 657; City Council v. Wright, 72 Ala. 411; Eureka Co. v. Bass, 81 Ala. 200; S. C., 60 Am. Rep. 152; North Penn. R. Co. v. Heileman, 49 Pa. St. 60; Cooley on Torts, 666; Whart. on Neg. § 420; Beach on Cont. Neg. § 163; Hathaway v. Railroad Co., 29 Fed. Rep. 489; 1 Thomp. on Neg. 401; Jochem v. Robinson, 66 Wis. 638; Detroit v. Van Steinburg, 17 Mich. 99; Fernandes v. Railroad Co., 52 Cal. 45; Hart v. Railroad Co., 80 N. Y. 622; Boss v, Railroad Co. (R. I.), 21 Am. & Eng. R. R. Cas. 364; Pierce on Railroads, 311; Patterson's Ry. Acc. L. §§ 382-384.

Il Filer v. Railroad Co., 49 N. Y. 47; Reading R. Co. v. Ritchie, 102 Pa. 8t. 425; Beach on Cont. Neg. § 162; Pierce v. Whitcom, 48 Vt. 127; S. C., 21 Am. Rep. 120; Todd v. Railroad Co., 3 Allen, 18; S. C., 80 Am. Dec. 49, and note; Indianapolis v. Cook, 99 Ind. 10; Larmore v. Iron Co., 101 N. Y. 391; Merrill v. North Yarmouth, 78 Me. 200; S. C., 57 Am. Rep. 794; Talman v. Railroad Co., 98 N. Y. 198; S. C., 23 Am. & Eng. R. R. Cas. 313; Schofield v. Railroad Co., 114 U. S. 615; Baker v. Fehr, 97 Pa. St. 70; Railroad Co. v. Greiner (Pa.), 28 Am. & Eng. R. R. Cas. 397.

19 Fernandes v. Railroad Co., 52 Cal. 45; Trow v. Railroad Co., 24 Vt. 487; Beach on Cont. Neg. § 161; Wharton on Neg. § 420; Railroad Co. v. Terry, 8 Ohio. St. 570.

13 Railroad Co. v. State, 36 Md. 366; Railroad Co. v. Whifield, 44 Miss. 446; Montgomery v. Wright, 72 Ala. 411; S. C., 47 Am. Rep. 422; Pleasants v. Faut, 22 Wall. 121; Detroit v. Van Steinburg, 17 Mich. 118; Pierce on Railroads, 222; Cumberland R. Co. v. State, 37 Md. 157; Bigellow's Lead. Cas. on Torts. 569.

low's Lead. Cas. on Torts, 580.

14 Thompson on Neg. 1225, § 10; Pierce on Railroads,

211. For the general doctrine of negligence the lawyer
must consult works devoted to that subject: Contributory Negligence, annotated case, see 26 Cent. L. J. 108.

city is made to depend on its negligence to keep its streets in repair, and the question of negligence is dependent on notice to the city of the existence of some defect or obstruction causing the injury; that where an agent, or quasi agent, of the city creates the defect by an authorized act, the law imputes notice to the employer.

What is sufficient notice, and what is necessary to imply it, is a question not susceptible of harmonious solution from the decisions of the courts. In absence of notice, or the existence of the defect for such a time as to imply notice or establish negligence, the corporation is not liable except when the doctrine of the principal case applies.18 But the doctrine of the principal case shows that the city is liable when the duty of maintaining the streets in a safe condition is especially imposed on it; therefore, when a dangerous improvement is made, and there is negligence on the part of the contractor under the corporation, it is liable to a person injured thereby, and the law imputes notice t 1e employer.16 D. H. PINGREY.

15 Market v. St. Louis, 56 Mo. 189; Moore v. Minneapolis, 19 Minn. 300; Atlanta v. Perdue, 53 Ga. 607; Higert v. Greencastle, 43 Ind. 574; Chicago v. Langlass, 66 Ill. 381; Boucher v. New Haven, 40 Conn. 456; Furnell v. St. Paul, 20 Minn. 117; Barnes v. Newton, 46 Iowa, 567; Studly v. Oshkosh, 45 Wis. 380; Morrill v. Portland, 4 Cliff. C. C. 138; Hays v. New York, 74 N. Y. 264; Farrell v. Oldtown, 69 Me. 72; Noble v. Richmond 31 Gratt. (Va.) 271; Perkins v. Fayette, 68 Me. 182; Weightman v. Washington, 1 Black. (U. S.) 39; Lindholm v. St. Paul, 19 Minn. "245; Castor v. Uxbridge, 39 U. C. (Q. B.) 113; Prindle v. Fletcher, 39 Vt. 257; Hart v. Brooklyn, 36 Barb. 226; Davis v. Plank Road, 27 Vt. 602; Reed v. Northfield, 13 Pick. (Mass.) 94.

16 Storrs v. Utica, 17 N. Y. 104; Detroit v. Corey, 9 Mich. 165; Brusso v. Buffalo, 90 N. Y. 679; Springfield v. Le Claire, 49 Ill. 477; 20 Cent. L. J. 383; also 163, § 7.

WEEKLY DIGEST

Of ALL the Current Opinions of all the State and Territorial Courts of Last Resort, and of the Supreme, Circuit and District Courts of the United States.

<u> </u>
ARKANSAS 56, 196
CALIFORNIA 3, 25, 35, 40, 53, 55, 93, 148, 150, 154, 168
COLORADO 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 26, 30, 45, 69, 101, 102, 119, 120, 122, 133 155, 169, 200
CONNECTICUT 185
GEORGIA 4, 18, 16, 32, 43, 46, 72, 77, 110, 164, 178, 179
INDIANA 58, 60, 98, 117, 130, 138, 141, 144, 160, 165, 175, 186
Iowa 5, 8, 24, 28, 38, 41, 44, 47, 52, 59, 63, 89, 92, 94, 99, 104, 111 115, 125, 135, 140, 145, 152, 156, 162, 188, 197
KENTUCKY 20, 128, 149
MAINE 21
MASSACHUSETTS 19, 33, 51, 62, 81, 82, 102, 107, 108, 109, 116 121, 131, 133, 134, 143, 161, 190, 192, 198
MICHIGAN 12, 28, 50, 61, 91, 146, 180, 186
MINNESOTA14, 123, 151, 181, 190
NEBRASEA
NEW JERSEY 64, 70, 74, 80, 95, 176
NEW YORK 27, 29, 67, 79, 126, 157, 184, 191
NORTH CAROLINA 15, 22, 48, 71, 86, 88, 96, 103, 114, 127, 134, 163, 172, 193, 195
Оню
OREGON 37, 67, 173
PENNSYLVANIA 10, 73, 76, 78, 87, 90, 97, 100, 105, 118, 124, 18, 189, 142, 147, 159, 166, 167, 170, 171, 174, 177, 189, 194
SOUTH CAROLINA G
TEXAS 17, 18, 31, 34, 36, 39, 42, 49, 54, 65, 83, 84, 406, 158, 181

- 1. APPEAL—Attachment—Bill of Exceptions— Review.
 —The order of a justice discharging or refusing to discharge an attachment will be reviewed by the court of common pleas upon a bill of exceptions. If the bill of exceptions shows that the only question is upon the weight of evidence the case will not be reviewed by the supreme court. Seville v. Wagner, S. C. Ohlo, Oct. 16, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 450.
- APPEAL—Bond—Time of Filing.— Under Colorado law, when the time for filing a bond on appeal from the county court, as allowed by the court, has expired, the court may at any time during the same term extend such time. — Pennington v. McNaily, S. C. Colo., Oct. 28, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 503.
- 3. APPEAL—Justices—Questions.——In California, an appeal on questions of law and fact from a justice's judgment, there having been no trial on issues of fact, must be entertained and decided by the superior court as on questions of law alone.—Fabretti v. Superior Court, S. C. Cal., Oct. 29, 1883; 19 Pac. Rep. 481.
- 4. APPEAL—New Trial—Uncontradicted Evidence.—
 Where the killing of stock is shown by the uncontradicted testimony of its employees not to have been
 caused by the negligence of the railraoad, a verdict for
 the plaintiff should be set aside. Georgia R. & R. Co. v.
 Wall, S. C. Ga., Jan. 30, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 639.
- APPEAL—Record—Abstract.—When the abstract falls to show that an appeal was taken, the case will be dismissed.—Schooley v. Globe Ins. Co., S. C. Iowa, Oct. 27, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 104.
- 6. APPEAL—Record—Errors. ——— An assigned error, that the court erred in denying a motion to strike out an amended answer, where the motion to strike out, and the exceptions to the ruling of the court thereon, are not preserved in the bill of exceptions, will not be considered on appeal. Whitney v. Teichfuss, S. S. Colo., Oct. 26, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 507.
- 7. APPEAL—Record—Errors. The overruling of a motion to strike out certain allegations in a replication, and the giving of instructions requested by the appellee, cannot be considered on appeal without a bill of exceptions. Brink v. Posey, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 467.
- 8. APPEAL—Record Instructions. —— Instructions cannot be considered on appeal, where no transcript of the evidence has been filed.—State v. Danials, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 29, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 109.
- 9. APPEAL—Weight of Evidence.—Where there is a conflict in the evidence, and the verdict is not manifestly against the weight of the evidence, the verdict of the jury will not be disturbed.—McGrath v. Bassick, S. O. Oolo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 462.
- 10. Assignment—Assignee Commissions Interest.
 ——An assignee is not entitled to commissions on a sale which he did not effect, although he had the power to sell but refrained from doing so at the request of the assignor. An assignee is liable for interest on money remaining in his hands which he did not invest, although he had authority to do so. Appeal of Hower, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 687.
- 11. ATTACHMENT—Intervention. —— A, president of a company, at its request advanced \$500 to a contractor. The contract was countermanded and A gave an order for the balance of the \$500 not earned. This balance was attached as a debt due the corporation: Held, that A could not claim this balance as his money. Sanders v. Page, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Fac. Rep. 468.
- 12. BILLS AND NOTES—Actions Consideration.

 Parol evidence that defendant signed the note, after refusing the maker, at the request of the payee on a promise that he should not be 'held upon it, is admissible to show want of consideration in a suit by the payee.— Kulenkamp v. Groff, S. O. Mich., Oct. 19, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 57.
- 13. BILLS AND NOTES—Consideration—Fertilizers.— Where the maker is sued on his note for the purchase of commercial fertilizers, no waiver or covenant will

- bar him, under Georgia law, from pleading the want of legal inspection. Faircloth v. DeLeon, S. C. Ga., July 11, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 640.
- 14. BILLS AND NOTES—Parol Contract.—Parol evidence is inadmissible to show that when a promissory note was executed it was agreed, that if the maker should be forced to assign the payee should file his claim with the assignee and execute a full release. Harrison v. Morrison. S. C. Minn., Nov. 2, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 66.
- 15. BOND—Constable—Action.——A constable's bond, as tax-collector, given to a town, should be prosecuted in the name of the town or its commissioners. Town of Warrenton v. Arnington, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 15, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 632.
- 16. CARRIERS—Delays Strikes. —— A railroad company is not liable for losses caused by delayed freights, where the cause of delay was an organized strike and resistance, which neither the railroad company nor the civil authorities, which were called upon, could control.—Haas v. Kansas City, etc. R. R., S. C. Ga., Oct. 10, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 629.
- 17. CARRIERS—Passengers—Alighting from Train.—
 It is error to charge, that what would be a reasonable time for a man to alight from a train would not be a reasonable time for an aged lady, that being a question for the jury.— St. Louis, etc. R. R. v. Burns, S. C. Tex., Oct. 19, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 467.
- 18. CARRYING WEAPONS— Penitentiary Guard. A penitentiary guard, not in the lawful discharge of his duty as such guard on the premises of the penitentiary, nor going nor returning to or from a place for the purpose of obtaining ammunition for his weapon, is liable, under the Texas law, for carrying weapons.— West v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 10, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 485.
- 19. CERTIORARI—Railroad Company Street Crossing—Statute. —— Construction of Massachusetts statutes relative to street crossings on railroads, the duty of county commissioners in relation thereto, the remedy for errors by certiorari or otherwise, and rulings as to costs incurred in such proceedings. Old Colony, etc. Co. v. City of Fall River, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 425.
- 20. CHAMPERTY Deed Adverse Possession. A conveyance of land in the actual adverse possession of a third person under claim of title is champertous and vold. Combs v. Mc Quinn, Ky. Ct. App., Nov. 3, 1988; 9 S. W. Rep. 495.
- 21. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—Corporation— Obligation of Contracts—Water Company. Where a water company had a right by charter to take water by pipes for the use of a city from a particular pond for domestic and other purposes, it is nevertheless competent for the legislature to authorize another company to take water for the same purposes in the same city from the same pond, the grant to the first company not being exclusive; the obligation of no contract is impaired by such second grant.—Rockland, etc. Co. v. Camden, etc. Co., S. J. C. Me., Nov. 3, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 785.
- 22. CONTRACT—Contemporaneous Writings.—— Papers executed at the same time, or acted upon cojointly, together constitute the contract and ascertain the respective relations and obligations of the parties to it.—
 Kitchen v. Grandy, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep.
- 23. CONTRACT—Deed—Escrow.—— In an action on a written contract to sell land, to be paid for in part by other land, defendant may show by parol, that the papers executed were placed in the hands of a third person, to be delivered when defendant's wife should assent to the transaction and his attorney approve plaintiff's title.— Dikeman v. Arnold, S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1886; 40 N. W. Rep. 42.
- 24. CONTRACTS—Writing Parol Variation. —— One who proposes to erect a building, and employs an architect by written contract to draw up plans and superintend the work, cannot show by parol that the building was not to be erected and the architect not to

be paid, unless a loan could be procured. — Marquis v. Lauretson, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 27, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 73.

25. CONSTRUCT—Construction. — A agreed to sell B all the fruit grown in a certain year on a farm, a portion of the purchase price was to be paid when the crop is taken off at the end of the year: Held, that the end of the fruit season was meant, and not the end of the calender year. — Brown v. Anderson, S. C. Cal., Oct. 23, 1888: 19 Pac. Rep. 487.

28. CORPORATIONS—Claims—Directors.——When a claim has been approved by the directors of a corporation acting separately, as was their custom, this is a sufficient approval in the absence of any law or by-law restricting the directors to a different mode.—Longmont S. D. Co. v. Cofman, S. C. Colo., Oct. 26, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 502.

27. CORPORATION — Contract — Public Policy — Ultra Vires—Restraint of Trade. — A contract made by a steamship company with the owner of a competing line, by which they agreed to pay him a certain sum monthly in consideration of his withdrawing his competition, is not ultra vires nor against public policy, nor in restraint of trade. —Leslie v. Lorillard, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 16, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 363.

28. Costs—Intoxicating Liquors—Search.—A search-warrant is served by making the search, and the officer is entitled to his fee, under Iowa law, though no intoxicating liquor for which the warrant was issued is found.

— Byram v. Polk Co., S. C. Iowa, Oct. 27, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 102.

30. Costs—Who Entitled.— Where the main object of a suit was to restrain the threatened sale of property named in a trust deed and for an accounting, costs may be awarded to the plaintiff, he being the successful party.— Beckwith v. Beckwith, S. C. Colo., Oct. 26, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 510.

31. COUNTIES—Organization—Registering Deeds.—Archer county was not attached to Clay for any purpose in August, 1875, and that the registration in the latter county, of a deed of land situated in the former, was not constructive notice.—Alford v. Jones, S. C. Tex., Oct. 23, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 470.

82. CRIMINAL LAW-Appeal—Demurrer. — The overruling of a demurrer to an indictment is not ground for a new trial, but can be considered on a bill of exceptions. — Flemister v. State, S. C. Ga., Oct. 5, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 642.

36. CRIMINAL LAW—Appeal—Transcript—Record.—The statute of Massachusetts does not prescribe the time when, in a criminal case, the transcript of the record shall be filed in the appellate court. It is sufficient if it be filed at any time during the next succeeding term in the county before the defendant is called on to plead.—Commonwealth v. McPherson, S. J. C. Mass., Nov. 13, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 417.

34. CRIMINAL LAW—Appeal from Justice—Bond.—An appeal bond, conditioned that the defendant shall prosecute her appeal with effect, and shall pay such fine and costs as shall be adjudded against her by the county court, as well as other costs that may be adjudged against her in the court below, complies with Texas law.—Elkins v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 24, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 491.

35. CRIMINAL LAW—Assault—Intent.——In an assault, which is commonly called a simple assault, if there is no present purpose and no present ability to do an injury, there is no assault. — People v. Dodel, S. C. Cal., Oct. 27, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 484.

36. CRIMINAL LAW—Assault to Murder—Variance.— Conviction may be had under an indictment for assault with intent to murder, alleged to have been committed with a gun, though the assault was committed with a pistol.— Douglass v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 10, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 489.

37. CRIMINAL LAW—Challenge—Tax·roll.—— When a challenge to a juror by the State, because his name was not on the assessment roll, it not appearing whether the juror was on the regular panel or not, has been allowed by the court, the judgment will not be reversed for this cause.—State v. Harding, S. C. Oreg., Oct. 23, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 449.

38. CRIMINAL LAW — Change of Venue — Costs. — When a change of venue is taken in a criminal case, the county where the case is tried is primarily liable for the costs, under Iowa law, which costs must be finally paid by the county from which the change was taken.— Lockhart v. Montgomery Co., 8. C. Iowa, Oct. 27, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 104.

39. CRIMINAL LAW — Disorderly House. — A combined retail grocery store and beer saloon, frequented by prostitutes and vagabonds for the purpose of drinking beer, is not a disorderly house, under Pen. Code Tex., art. 339. — Harmes v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 20, 1888: 9 S. W. Rep. 487.

40. CRIMINAL LAW—Former Jeopardy. —— A conviction for manslaughter reversed on appeal does not sustain pleas of former acquittal and once in jeopardy on a retrial for murder. — *People v. Carty*, S. C. Cal., Oct. 23, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 490.

41. CRIMINAL LAW—Grand Jury—Filling Vacancies.— Under Iowa law, where one of seven jurors, selected for the grand jury from those appearing, is discharged before the jury is impaneled, the court may order the sheriff to select one of those not drawn to take his place.—State v. Gurlagh, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1988; 40 N. W. Rep. 141.

42. CRIMINAL LAW-Highway-Obstruction. — When the evidence shows that, when defendant built his fence, which was alleged to an obstruction, he honestly believed it was upon his own land as the survey indicated, a conviction for obstructing a public road cannot stand. — Parsons v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 20, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 490.

43. CRIMINAL LAW—Homicide— Justifiable. — Where there was evidence of deceased's criminal intimacy with defendant's wife, that defendant had requested him to leave her alone, and that just before the killing he went with her up a dark alley, it is for the jury to say whether the killing is justifiable. — Cloud v. State, S. C. Ga., Oct. 17. 1883: 7 S. E. Red. 641.

44. CRIMINAL LAW — Indictment — Prostitution.
Under Iowa law, on an indictment charging a count for
enticing a virtuous female to a house of ill-fame, and
another for concealing or assisting to conceal a female
so enticed, and another count charging both offenses,
judgment cannot be rendered on a general verdict of
guilty.—State v. Terrill, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 81, 1888; 40 N. W.
Rep. 128.

45. CRIMINAL LAW — Jurisdiction — Ordinances. — Under the Colorado constitution, the criminal courts have no jurisdiction of a prosecution for violating a city ordinance in carrying on the business of ticket brokerage without a license.— Garland v. City of Denver, S. C. Colo, Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 460.

47. CRIMINAL LAW—Larceny—Trick.——If possession of goods is obtained by a trick, artifice, or false pretenses, with the felonious intent on the part of the accused to convert them to his own use, he is guilty of larceny.—State v. Hall, S. C. Iowa, Oct., 27, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 107.

48. CRIMINAL LAW- Opening Statement. — The trial court may permit the prosecuting attorney to open the

argument by merely stating his propositions of law without discussing his theories as to the facts.— State v. Anderson, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 678.

49. CRIMINAL LAW— Reception of Evidence. — Under Texas law, the trial court may in its discretion, after the close of the testimony by both the State and the defendant, allow the State to introduce a witness to corroborate a former witness. — Farris v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 10, 1888; 3 S. W. Rep. 487.

50. CRIMINAL LAW—Sentence — Less Penalty. — A sentence, on a conviction for illegal sale of intoxicating liquor, imposing a fine, and in default of payment imprisonment, being lighter than it might have been, cannot be complained of by the offender. — People v. Rouse, S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 57.

51. CRININAL LAW — Separation of Jury. —— A temporary separation of the jury, one of the jurors remaining in the jury-room in charge of an officer while the others are at supper, is not, as matter of law, ground for a new trial. — Commoncealth v. Gagle, S. J. C. Mass., Nov. 12, 1883; 18 N. E. Rep. 417.

52. CRIMINAL LAW-Trial—Attorney Assisting.——On appeal, when the facts are not before it, the appellate court will not say that the court abused its discretion in allowing an attorney to assist the county attorney in the prosecution.—State v. Shinner, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 144.

53. DEDICATION—Street — Acceptance. — The conveyance of land within a town by deed, decaribing the land as bounded by certain designated streets, if projected, and designated as being a quarter of a certain block, as laid down on the official map of said town, together with five years' use of the projected streets by the public, constitutes a complete dedication of such streets to public use without a formal acceptance by the town. — City of Eureka v. Craghan, S. C. Cal., Oct. 27, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 485.

54. DEED—Description—Uncertainty. —— A deed describing the land conveyed as all the lands contained in patent No. 383, vol. 15, first class, to me granted by the State of Texas, that have not been legally sold or disposed of for location, the above lands being situated and lying in the county of W, and fully described in patent which accompanies this deed, is not void for uncertainty. — Falls L. & C. Co. v. Chrisholm, S. C. Tex., Oct. 23, 188; 9 S. W. Rep. 479.

55. DEED—Escrow—Delivery. — A mortgagor agreed to execute a deed to the mortgage and deliver it to a third person, to be delivered to the mortgage on default by him in paying an agreed sum less than the mortgage, provided the mortgagee receipted in full. He made default, demanded back his deed, which he did not review, and conveyed the land to A, who knew the facts. The holder delivered the deed to the mortgagee's attorney, who executed a receipt in full: Held, that the delivery was binding on the mortgagor and his grantee took no title.—McDonald v. Huff, S. C. Cal., Oct. 24, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 499.

56. DESCENT AND DISTRIBUTION — Intestate Leaving only Nicces and Nephews. — Under the provisions of Manst. Dig. Ark. § 2522, that if an intestate leave surviving him neither children, father nor mother, his estate shall descend to his brothers and sisters, or their descendants, in equal parts, the nephews and nieces of intestate, his father and mother, brothers and sisters being dead, take per capita, and the children of a deceased nephew or niece take per stirpes. — Garrett v. Bean, S. C. Ark., Oct. 27, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 435.

87. DIVORCE — Custody of Children. — When a divorce is decreed, the care of the minor children should be given to the party not in fault, unless it is manifestly improper so to do and a special finding of fact made by the court to that effect.—Lambert v. Lambert, S. C. Oreg., Oct. 11, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 459.

58. DIVORCE—Setting Aside— Evidence—Witness—Impeachment—New Trial. —— Where a husband fraudulently obtains a divorce from his wife by causing the petition to be filed in her name, such divorce will be

set aside upon her petition, and she is a competent witness for that purpose. Newly-discovered evidence which only tends to impeach a witness is not ground for a new trial. — Brown v. Grove, S. C. Ind., Oct. 23, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 387.

59. DOWER-Homestead-Election.— Until the distributive share is set apart, the widow, by occupying homestead, will be regarded as having elected to take it, under Iowa law. — McDonald v. McDonald, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 126.

60. Drainage—Assessment—Jurisdiction—County.—Upon petition in one county for a ditch leading into another county, the county court of the former county has jurisdiction to have it constructed in the latter county and to assess for the costs thereof lands in the latter county.—Hudson v. Bunch, S. C. Ind., Oct. 24, 1888; 18 N. E. Rap. 390.

61. EASEMENT—Railways— Right of Way. —— Where a right of way is condemned solely for the passage of trains and not for switching and making up trains, by A company, which leaves it to B company, which by agreement uses it in common with D company, A and B companies are liable for damages sustained from the unlawful use of it by D company in switching and making up trains. — Backus v. Detroit, etc. R. R., S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 60.

62. EASEMENT—Right of Way—Construction. —— Construction of a conveyance by which the grantor reserved a right of way over the land conveyed. **Relation and under the terms of that instrument, no right of way over another lot subsequently sold to the same grantee, not having reserved that right in the conveyance of the latter lot.—*Leach v. Hastings, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 406.

63. EJECTMENT—Mesne Profits — Improvements.

Under Iowa law, on a petition by an occupying claimant for allowance for improvements after judgment for plaintiff, in an action to recover the land the plaintiff is entitled to a counterclaim for the use and occupation prior to his judgment.— Wells v. Newsom, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 27, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 105.

64. ELECTION—County Officers — Justice of the Peace. —A justice of the peace is a county officer, under the election laws of New Jersey. — State v. Clark, S. C. N. J., Nov. 12, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 831.

65. ELECTIONS — Illegal Voting. — Knowledge of a person voting that he has been convicted of an assault with intent to murder is equivalent to the knowledge that he is not a qualified voter.— Thompson v. State, Tex. Ct. App., Oct. 10, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 486.

66. EMINENT DOMAIN—Compensation—Streets.——A railroad, lowering the grade of a street to adjust it to its tracks, is liable to an adjacent lot owner injured thereby, as for land taken for the company's use, though none of the lot itself is taken.—Shealy v. Chicago, etc. R. R., S. C. Wis., Oct. 8, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 145.

67. EMINENT DOMAIN—Wharves—Statute. — Under the statutes of New York, the owner of the bulk head may maintain an action against the city for building a bulk head in front of his, thereby destroying his wharf privileges, unless the city pays or tenders to him the proper compensation. — Kingsland v. Mayor, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 26, 1889; 18 N. E. Rep. 435.

68. EQUITY-Damages—Assessment. —— In chancery to restrain further detention of land, damages for injury already received may be determined by reference to the master. — Busby v. Mitchell, S. C. S. Car., Oct. 19, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 618.

69. EQUITY — Rescission of Contract — Mistake. — Where it was the intention of both grantor and granteethat the conveyance should be of land on which stood a building, and that was the main inducement to the purchase, but by mutual mistake as to its location the conveyance did not include it, the grantee is entitled to a rescission.—Barth v. Deuel, S. C. Colo., June 1, 1888; 19-Pac. Rep. 471.

70. EQUITY PLEADING - Abatement of Action. - A

party who has sued in his own name for his own interest and has parted with his interest, cannot prosecute the suit thereafter. Where a plea is filed which goes to the whole equity of the bill, and afterwards a motion is made by which the truth of the plea is conceeded, the plea will be held to be allowed. Statement of the difference between a bill in the nature of a revisor and a supplemental bill. Where an original complainant has assigned his interest his assignee must proceed to litigate the case by an original bill in the nature of a supplemental bill. — Fulton v. Greacen, N. J. Ct. Chan., Nov. 9, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 827.

- 71. EVIDENCE—Parol—Writings.—— A written agreement to raft certain logs properly for towing, the price to be paid on delivery to the towing vessel, cannot be varied by showing a parol contemporaneous agreement, that the logs were not to be rafted until the purchaser furnished the necessary rafting gear.—Meek-ins v. Neuberry, S. C. Car., Oct. 15, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 655.
- 72. EVIDENCE—Writings—Parol.——Parol evidence is admissible to show that the time specified in the written contract for the completion of machinery was regarded as essential, and also to show that the purchase of cotton seed in advance, in order to have the same ready for the manufacture of oil by that time, was contemplated.— Van Winkle v. Wilkins, S. C. Ga., May 2, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 644.
- 73. ESTOPPEL—Corporation—Stockholder—Contract. Circumstances stated under which a stockholder of a corporation, who was under a contract to supply cans to it, is estopped from denying the title of a purchaser of fruit from that corporation.— Kilgore v. Smith, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1889; 15 Atl. Rep. 698.
- 74. EXECUTION—Sale Redemption Equity Evidence. —— Circumstances stated under which it was held that there was no sufficient evidence before the court that the purchaser at an execution sale had promised the defendant that he might redeem the property, and that the bill for that purpose must be dismissed. Maloney v. Herbert, N. J. Ct. Chan., Nov. 8, 1888; ib Atl. Rep. 824.
- 75. EXECUTORS—Claims—Sureties. —— B became administrator of A with C as surety. B was removed for squandering the estate. C was appointed and charged with the penalty of B's bond. C died and D was appointed, who filed a claim as such for the full amount of B's bond against C's estate: Held, that C's liability could only be determined by settling his account as A's administrator de bonis non, and charging him with the balance after allowing all just credits.—Brown v. Jacobs, S. C. Neb., Oct. 31, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 137.
- 76. EXECUTOR—Commissions—Contract.——An agreement by executors, on taking possession of the estate, that the commissions for their services should be divided equally among them, is a valid contract npon sufficient consideration. The fact that the work was chiefly done by one of the executors is immaterial.—

 John v. John, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 16 Atl. Rep. 675.
- 77. EXECUTOR Fraud Bona Fide Purchaser.
 Fraud between the administrator and his immediate vendee will not effect subsequent purchasers who are such bona fide and for value, and who derive title through his deed without notice of the fraud.— King v. Cabaniss. S. C. Ga., Oct. 3, 1885; 7 S. E. Rep. 620.
- 78. EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS Accounting Investment—Conversion. Where an executor invested the money of the testatrix in the stock of a bank for which she had expressed a preference, and the stock by mistake was made in the name of the executor personally: Held, that he was not liable for the loss on the stock, there being no conversion.—Appeal of Pensyl, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1889; 15 Atr. Rep. 719.
- 79. EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS—Bond Action Upon Bond. Where the letters of one admistrator are revoked, execution issued against him and returned sulls bons, the bond may be sued upon by the other admistrator, although it is a joint bond given

- with sureties by both administrators.—Sperb v. McCons, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 26, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 441.
- 86. EXECUTOR AND ADMINISTRATOR Parties Accounting. Where an executor, having different amounts of money in his hands to invest for the benefit of several different persons, who makes one investment including all the funds, and ultimately converts the whole to his own use: *Held*, that all the beneficiaries of the several trusts are necessary parties to a proceeding for an accounting by him.—*Deegan v. Capner*, N. Y. Ct. Chan,, Nov. 8, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 819.
- 81. EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATOS— Sale of Lands to Pay Debts Title. Construction of Massachusetts statutes relative to the sale of land by an administrator to pay the debts of the intestate, the notice to be given of an application for license to make such sale, who may oppose such sale: Held, that the administrator can only sell the title of the decedent, and that no question of his title was involved or could be raised. Walker v. Fuller, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep 400.
- 82. Highway-Sidewalk-Defects Town. Circumstances stated under which it was held that a town is liable for a defective sidewalk when it had, or might have had, notice of such defect. Noyes v. Inhabitants, etc. Co., 8. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 423.
- 83. HOMESTEAD—Business—Extent.—— Where A becomes insolvent and makes an assignment, but continues to use his business house for a business he carries on, such house and the two lots, on part of both of which it stands, are exempt from execution as a business homestead, under Texas law. Hargadine v. Whitfield, S. C. Tex. Oct. 19, 1885; 9 S. W. Rep. 475.
- 84. Homestead Illegal Levy Damages. —— The facts that land claimed as a homestead is not paid for, that claimant has made a conditional sale of it which has failed, and that after the levy on crops thereon he has reconveyed it to his vendor, do not interfere with his right to exemption nor to damages for the levy. Lee v. Welborne, S. C. Tex., Oct. 19, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 471.
- 85. Homestead—Mortgage—Wife's Signature.
 Under Wisconsin law, a mortgage of a homestead by a
 married man, without his wife's signature, is void,
 though at the time she is living apart from him.—Herros
 v. Knapp S. & Co., S. C. Wis., Oct. 8, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep.
 140.
- 86. HUSBAND AND WIFE—Conveyance—Private Examination. The private examination of an infant married woman as to her execution of a deed is, under North Carolina law, not conclusive, and does not bar any right of dower she might have in the lands conveyed.—Eppo v. Flowers, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Bep. 680.
- 87. FERRY—Franchise— Construction. —— Construction of Pennsylvania statutes relative to a ferry across the Susquehanna river at the town of Sunbury. Sunbury v. Grant, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 706.
- 88. FISHERIES—Nets—Constitutional Law. ——Code N. C. § 3383, prohibiting the setting or fishing of a dutch or pod net in certain rivers, is constitutional. Rea v. Hampton, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 15, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 619.
- 89. FRAUD—Confidential Relations.—A, who had been B's confidential business adviser, urged B to invest in a new enterprise, representing that certain property purchased for the purpose cost \$20,000, when in realty it cost \$14,000. On that basis B invested and secured a one-third interest in the corporation formed for the purpose, paying more than the other two thirds cost A and another: Held, that the representation was actionable.— Teachout v. Van Hoesen, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 96.
- 90. Frauds Statute of Promise to Pay Debt of Another.——Circumstances stated under which it was held that if the testimony of the plaintiff was to be believed the defendants were liable upon an original contract to pay for the printing of a book, and that they did not promise to pay the debt of another, and

that the statute of frauds did not apply. — Greenough v. Bichholtz, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 712.

91. FRAUDS—Statute of—Sale — Coal. — Defendant cannot, in an action for the price of coal, recoup damages for breach of a contract to furnish him coal during the season, when the only evidence of his contract under the statute of frauds is a letter in July from him, accepting an oral offer, to which defendant sent a reply refusing to furnish certain coal he desired.—Delaware & H. Co. v. Roberts, S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 53.

92. FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES — Bills in Equity — Merger. —— The grantee in a fraudulent conveyance, who purchases subsequent judgments against his grantor, while suits are pending thereon to subject such property thereto, acquiree the lien created by the institution of such suits, and such lien is paramount to a lien acquired by another creditor bringing a similar suit.—Fordyce v. Hicks, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 25, 1838; 40 N. W. Rep. 79.

93. FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE—Bona Fide Purchaser.
— Though a deed to A is fraudulent and void as to creditors, a conveyance by A to B for valuable consideration without notice of the fraud would be valid, although B knew of the levy of the attachment lien.

Morrow v. Graves, S. C. Cal., Oct. 22, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 480.

94. FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES — Judgment — Collateral Attack. — In an action to enforce a judgment against property in the hands of the debtor's grantee, the grantee cannot show that service in the action, wherein it was obtained, was accepted in another State, when the acceptance itself does not so show. — Wright Mahafey, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 29, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 112.

95. FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE — Mortgage. —— Circumstances stated under which it was held that a mortgagor retaining possession and carrying on business on the mortgaged premises, partly in the name of the mortgagee and partly on his own account, rendering no account, and admitting that the object of the mortgage was to secure the property from his creditors, is guilty of fraud, and that the conveyance was fraudulent. — Decker v. Wilson, N. J. Ct. Chan., Nov. 2, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 816.

96. FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES— Mortgages — Possession. —— A sold a stock of goods to B, taking B's notes secured by a mortgage on the goods, which provided, that B should carry on the business and pay A within a reasonable time from the proceeds. Nothing showed that the mortgage was executed in bad faith or to secure an antecedent debt, and in a few months B paid more than \$60 on the debt: Held, that the evidence rebutted any presumption of fraud, because B had possession of and sold the goods, and in violation of his agreement bought other goods and intermingled them with these.—Kreth v. Rogers, S. C. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; S. E. Rep. 682.

97. INDEMNITY—Contract—Construction—Surety.—Where a surety or indorser is indemnified by a mortgage to secure him against his liability on certain named notes, executed by his principal and against liability on the removal of those notes: Held, that under the terms of the agreement the surety was entitled to indemnity from the mortgage against his liability on a note which was outstanding when the mortgage was executed. — Appeal of Lancaster Nat. Bank, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 18 Atl. Rep. 697.

98. INDICTMENT—Statute—Burden of Proof—Physician.
—— An indictment which charges an offense in the language of the statute is sufficient. An indictment charging that defendant practiced medicine without a license is sustained by proof showing that he practiced medicine within two years. The burden of proof to show that he had a license is upon the defendant.—Ben-ham v. State, S. C. Ind., Nov. 9, 1888; 18 N. E. Bep. 464.

 Infant—Contract—Disaffirmance.—— Thirty two days after attaining majority is a reasonable time within which a contract made in infancy may be disaffirmed, under Iowa law. — Leacox v. Griffith, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 29, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 169. 100. INJUNCTION—Injunction Bond— Bond — Waste — Mistake. — Where an injuction is issued to restrain the defendant from committing waste on land to which he makes no claim, and of which he is not in possession, the land being misdescribed by mistake, no action will lie upon the injunction bond.—Kulp v. Bowen, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 717.

101. INNKEEPERS—Liens—Stable-keeper.—— A livery stable-keeper, who is also an innkeeper, and who falls to show that the owner of horses, which he has kept and cared for, was his guest, cannot set up the innkeeper's lien at common law.— Walt v. Garrison, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 469.

102. INSOLVENCY—Fraudulent Conveyance. —— Construction of the insolvent laws of Massachusetts, and circumstances stated under which it was held to be a question for the jury, whether, under the evidence the case came within the statute of Massachusetts, ch. 157, § 98, which provides that sales not in the ordinary course of business should be prima facte evidence that the purchaser believed in the contemplated insolvency of the seller.—Stevens v. Pierce, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 411.

103. Insurance—Life— Application. —— An application for insurance, with a warranty of truthfulness, stated that B, the beneficiary, was the applicant's cousin. Upon the refusal of insurance A wrote in the name of B, and, on his authority, that B was a creditor and dependant on A. The policy was then issued. It was found that B was a creditor but not dependant on A: Heid, that the letter was not a part of the application, but admissible on the question of frand in procuring the insurance. — Mace v. Provident L. I. Ass'n., S. O. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 674.

104. INSURANCE—Mutual Benefit—Waiver. —— A mutual benefit association issuing a certificate, with a provision avoiding it in case the insured injured his health by the use of stimulants, with the right to cancel it during his life for such action, to a person known to its agent to be a confirmed drunkard, waives its right to defend an action on the certificate on that ground. — Newman v. Covenant M. B. Ass., S. C. Iowa, Oct. 26, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 87.

105. INSURANCE—Mutual Insurance—Membership.— Circumstances stated under which it was held that a party who had taken out a policy on his barn in a mutual insurance company and paid the premium thereon was a member of the company. — Farmers', etc. Co. v. Mylin, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 710.

106. Insurance—Waiver—Estoppel.——An insurance company is estopped from setting up the failure of the policy to state certain facts required to be stated if they existed, where the company's agent, when issuing the policy, knew that the facts existed.— Crescent Ins. Co. v. Camp, S. C. Tex., Oct. 19, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 473.

107. INTOXICATING LIQUORS—Evidence — Illegal Sales.
—Upon a prosecution for illegal sale of liquors, evidence that one of the purchasers was seen to give money to one M was admitted, but the jury were properly instructed that they should disregard it unless they were satisfied that M and the defendant were conferates—Commonwealth v. McDonald, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 16 N. E. Rep. 402.

106. INTOXICATING LIQUORS—Illegal Sale — Evidence.
—Circumstances stated under which it was held that
evidence of an illegal sale of liquor
against the defendant to go to the jury.—Communication
v. Murphy, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 403.

169. INTOXICATING LIQUORS — Illegal Sales —Prosecution. ——Any person may prosecute for violation of the law prohibiting illegal sales of liquors, although it is made a special duty of certain public officers to do so. —Commonwealth e. Murphy, S. J. C. Mass., Nov. 12, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 418.

110. INTOXICATING LIQUORS—Judicial Cognizance.— Alcohol is, as matter of law, an intoxicant.— Snider v. State, 8. C. Ga., Oct. 17, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 631.

111. INTOXICATING LIQUORS- Transportation-Permit.

——Under Code Iowa, § 1553, the driver of a team, for one who undertakes with his own wagons to deliver intoxicating liquors without the certificate of the county auditor, is punishable. — State v. Campbell, 8. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 100.

112. IRRIGATION — Rights of Riparian Owners.—— A valid appropriation of the waters of a stream, to the exclusion of a riparian owner, may be made for the purpose of irrigation, though the lands to be irrigated are not located on the banks or in the neighborhood of the stream.—Hammond v. Rose, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1688; 19 Pac. Rep. 466.

113. JUDGMENT—Amendment—County Court. —— In a term case the county court may, upon the motion of a party to the action, upon due notice to the adverse party, amend a docket entry to conform to the facts.—Grimes v. Grosjean, S. C. Neb., Oct. 31, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 137.

114. JUDGMENT — Default — Excusable Neglect.

When a defendant sent to an insolvent attorney in another part of the State the necessary papers for his defense, who allowed judgment to go against him for want of a verified answer, the defendant not having consulted with his attorney, nor being aware of such requirement, the default was set aside.— Gwathmey v. Sarage, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 15, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 661.

115. JUDGMENT—Dismissal on Demurrer. —— A dismissal of a petition on demurrer for want of merits, the plaintiff refusing to amend, is an adjudication of all matters pleaded, or which could or should have been pleaded in the petition to entitle plaintiff to the relief therein prayed.—Lamb v. McConkey, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 26, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 77.

116. JUDGMENT—Impeachment.——A domestic judgment may be impeached in an action thereon by evidence that, at the time the suit was brought in which it was recovered, defendant therein was a non-resident of the State and had no notice of its commencement or pendency.—Needham v. Thayer, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 22, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 429.

117. JUDGMENT — Res Adjudicata—Divorce.—Where, by the decree in a divorce suit, it is adjudged that certain funds in a bank belonged to the wife, the husband cannot maintain an action against the bank for such funds, the ownership of them being res adjudicata.—Glaze v. Citizens', etc. Co., S. C. Ind., Nov. 9, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 450.

118. JUDGMENT—Res Adjudicata—Partition—Appeal.—
Where a proceeding for partition hed been decided by
the trial court, and the judgment set aside and appeal
taken to an appellate court, and a second proceeding
for partition instituted, the judgment in the first case
is no bar to the second petition; it is not res adjudicate
until after the reversal of the decree in the first case.—
Appeal of Small, S. C. Penn., Oct, 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 807.

119. JURISDICTION— Appearance.—By appearing in the county court and entering on the trial on the merits, a defendant gives that court complete jurisdiction of the action.—Reed v. Cates, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888: 19 Pag. Rep. 464.

120. JUSTICE OF THE PEACE—Appeal—Dismissal.—Under Colorado law, the filing of the transcript on appeal from a justice in the appellate court is necessary to give the latter sufficient jurisdiction to warrant a dismissal of the appeal.—Denver, etc. R. Co. v. Rader, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1886; 19 Pac. Rep. 476.

121. LINDLORD AND TENANT—Abatement and Revivor—False Representations—Evidence.—An action can be maintained by the lessee against the lessor for falsely representing that the house leased was healthy. Such actions survive upon the death of the plaintiff to his representatives. Evidence is admissible in such cases as to the condition of the drainagulof the house before, at and after the execution of the lease.—Cutter S. Hamlen, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 297.

122. LANDLORD AND TENANT—Denial of Title. ——Plaintiff having proved the execution of a lease and defendant's possession under it, defendant cannot

deny plaintiff's title or set up an outstanding title in another.—*Eckles v. Booco*, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 465.

123. LANDLORD AND TENANT— Lease.——A company erected certain buildings on its land, where B boarded its men, furnishing the houses and paying the company rent. The company deducted from the pay of their men the board they owed, paying to B the amount, after deducting the rent due to it: Held, that this amounted to a lease, and the possession of the buildings was in B.—Lightbody v. Truelsen, S. C. Minn., Nov. 2, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 67.

124. LANDLORD AND TENANT—Lease—Possession.——Alessee who is unable to obtain possession on account of a prior parol lease, may sue the lessor upon an implied covenant for quiet and peaceable possesion.—
Brennan v. Jacobs, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 685.

125. LANDLORD AND TENANT—Release—Discharge.—A contract between lessor and lessee, by which they release and relieve one another from all the terms and obligations of the lease, releases an obligation of the lessee to pay taxes not then due or payable, though previously assessed.—Henry v. Chrisinger, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 121.

126. LIGENSE — Parol License — Revocation — Limitations—Easement. ——A parol agreement between the owner of a spring and another that the latter may take all water necessary for domestic purposes from the spring, is a mere license, and may be revoked by the grant to a third person of the right to take all the water in the spring by pipes. But if the licensee continues to use the spring according to the terms of his license for twenty years his easement is complete, and he may continue to use the water.—Eckerson v. Crippen, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 26, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 443.

127. Liens—Landlords—Crops—Priority.——A mortgagor in possession after condition broken cannot give a lien on the crop superior to all others, under Code N. C. § 1799, and when he subsequently takes a lease from the mortgagee, the lien of the latter on the crops, under § 1754, takes precedence.—Brewer v. Chappell, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Bep. 670.

128. LIMITATIONS—Suits—Return of Summons.—Under Kentucky law, where a summons was issued and served within the period of limitation for the action, but cited defendant to appear at the next term, which commenced within ten days, and a continuance was had to the following term, which was after the period of limitation had expired, the statute of limitations is no bar to the action.—Louisville, etc. R. Co. v. Smith, Ky. Ct. App., Oct. 27, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 493.

129. Logs—Intermingling — Compensation. — The Wisconsin law, giving compensation to an owner for driving logs, which have become intermingled with his own, includes bailees, under the term owner, and it is immaterial whether the intermingling occurred at the beginning of or during the drive.— Wisconsin, etc. A. v. Comstock L. Co., S. C. Wis., Nov. 8, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 146.

130. Lost Instrument—Averment—Evidence.——In an action on a lost note, it is sufficient to aver that the note is lost; there need be no averment that diligent search had been made; that is a matter of evidence. An allegation that defendant had failed to pay the note in work, as he had agreed to do, is a sufficient averment that the note was unpaid when the suit was brought.—Douthit v. Mohr, S. C. Ind., Nov. 9, 1889; 18 N. E. Red. 449.

131. MASTER AND SERVANT — Fellow-servant — Negligence. — Construction of Massachusetts statutes giving to a servant injured by the negligence of a fellow-servant an action against the master for such negligence. Circumstances stated under which no action can be maintained.—Ashley v. Hart, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 29, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 416.

132. MASTER AND SERVANT-Negligence-Jury. —— A was sent by his employer to remove one of its electric lamps and connect the wires with the circuit. He knew nothing about such work. While he was so en-

gaged the electric current was turned on earlier than was its custom: *Held*, that a nonsuit was properly refused, the questions of negligence and contributory negligence being for the jury.—*Colorado E. Co. v. Lubbers*, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 479.

133. MECHANIC'S LIEN—Apportionment. —— Circumstances stated under which it was held that where work was done on an entire contract there could be no apportionment, although two parties were interested, and consequently there could be no lien.—Cahill v. Capen, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 419.

134. MISTAKE—New Trial—Amendment—Record.—When a mistake has been committed in the trial court in a case originating before a trial justice, on appeal a new trial will be granted in order that the trial justice may amend the record.—Commonwealth v. LeClaire, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 22, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 428.

135. MORTGAGE—Judgment—Res Adjudicata. — A party, who was made a party to foreclosure proceedings for the purpose of settling his liability, and did not show to the court his suretyship, as required by law, in order not to be considered equally liable with the principal debtor, is bound by the decree.—Case v. Hicks, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 25, 1883; 40 N. W. Rep. 75.

136. MORTGAGE — Possession—Growing Crops.——In North Carolina, a mortgagee is entitled to possession and the crops produced on the land till the debt is paid, in the absence of any contrary agreement, and his rights are not abridged by a clause expressly providing that the crops shall not be removed in any year until the installment for that year is paid.—Coor v. Smith, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1889; 7 S. E. Rep. 669.

137. NEGLIGENCE—Action—Instruction.— Where, in an action for damages for the death of plaintiff's minor son, the court charged the jury that if plaintiff knew that the work in which the son was engaged was dangerous, he was guilty of contributory negligence, but added "I refer you to the general charge," the general charge was that if the defendant falled to apply suitable appliances the jury should ascertain plaintiff's damages: Held, that the general charge was erroneous, because it withdrew the question of negligence from the jury.—Schuenk v. Kehler, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 694.

138. NEGLIGENCE—Contributory Negligence.——Circumstances stated under which it was held that a person well acquainted with the usual manner of switching cars, who stepped from the track and was injured by a train, was guilty of contributory negligence.—Ohio, etc. Co. v. Hill, S. C. Ind., Nov. 10, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 461.

139. NEGLIGENCE—Contributory Negligenee.——Circumstances stated under which it was held that a person killed by the falling of a car from a trestle had been guilty of contributory negligence, and his representative could not recover damages.—Carroll v. Pennsylvania, etc. Co., S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 688.

140. NEGLIGENCE—Evidence—Admissibility.——In an action against a railroad, where the evidence is conflicting as to whether there was a low joint on the track, by which the engine was derailed, it is competent to show that defendant's employees raised the joint immediately after raising the engine.—Kuhas v. Wisconsin, etc. R. Co., S. C. Iowa, Oct. 26, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 92.

141. NEGLIGENCE—Implied Negligence — Corporation.

—A woman, who was invited to ride in a vehicle by the owner thereof, cannot be charged with his alleged negligence, when she sues the city on account of injuries suffered by reason of an obstruction negligently left in the street.— Town of Enightstown v. Musgrove, S. C. Ind., Nov. 9, 1888; 18 N E. Rep. 452.

142. NEGLIGENCE — Jury. — Circumstances stated in which it was held that the question whether a min ing company was liable to the plaintiff for injuries received in consequence of the alleged negligence of the company's servant was for the jury. — Ebright v. Mineral, etc. Co., S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 709.

143. New Trial-Appeal. A question of law avail-

able, but not raised, at the trial cannot be raised on motion for a new trial; no appeal lies from an order of the superior court overruling a motion for a new trial.

—Holdsworth v. Tucker, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 29, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 430.

144. NEW TRIAL—Statutory Right. —— Under the Indiana statutes the defeated party in ejectment case is entitled as of right to a new trial within a year: Held, that this statute applies to a case in which it is sought to revest in the grantor the title of land which he had been induced by fraud to convey. — McKitrick v. Glenn, S. C. Ind., Oct. 23, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 388.

145. PARENT AND CHILD—Labor of Children.— Where some of the children acquire property for themselves and the other children under an agreement with the parents that it shall belong to the children, and not to the family generally, is not liable for the debts of the children.—Bener v. Edgington, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 29, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 117.

146. Partnership—Frauds—Individual Creditors.—A partner who admits that he has in his hands money which he has drawn out of the firm, cannot hold it subject to possible claims of creditors of the firm as against his own creditors, but may be required to deliver it to a receiver in a proceeding by creditor's bill.—Hamilton v. Harris, S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1885; 40 N. W. Rep. 56.

147. PATENTS—Agreement for Assignment—Construction.——The terms of a contract stated under which the obligor was held to be bound to transfer the obligee all his patents granted or applied for, and all his improvements, i. e., inventions made by his subsequently to the date of the contract upon the same subject-matter. The contract held also to include all reissues and renewals. Equity will enforce the performance of such a contract.—Appeal of Reese, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Red. 807.

148. PLEDGE—Conversion—Ratification. — Where a pledgee converts the pledge by selling it without public notice and buying it himself, the pledger, if he does not within a reasonable time after notice, disaffirm the sale, loses his right to do so. — Hill v. Finigan, S. C. Cal., Oct. 24. 1888: 19 Pac. Rep. 494.

149. PLEADING— Assault — Demurrer. —— A petition alleging that defendant unlawfully assaulted plaintiff, thereby putting him in great fear, but not stating how the assault was made, is demurrable. — Stivers v. Baker, Ky. Ct. App., Oct. 30, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 491.

150. PLEADINGS—Certiorari — Judgment. — Where on demurrer to a petition for certiorari it is decided that the appointment of a guardian ad litem for minor parties is not necessary to the validity of a judgment in a will contest, an answer that defendant court set aside the judgment because no guardian had been appointed for the minors, presents no material question of fact, and petitioners may have judgment on the pleadings.—Cerpenter v. Superior Court, S. C. Cal., Oct. 27, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 500.

151. PLEADING—Default—Answer.——The motion for leave to answer after default was properly denied, since the delay of five months was not satisfactorily excused, and the proposed answer set up no facts constituting a defense. — St. Paul L. Co. v. Dayton, S. C. Minn., Nov. 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 66.

152. PLEADING—Defenses — Tender. ——— In an action against a railroad for killing stock, a tender of damages pleaded as a distinct defense admits that the company ought to have fenced, though a general denial in another count covers such issue, and though Iowa law authorizes inconsistent defenses. — Taylor v. Chicago, etc. R. R., S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 84.

153. POWERS—Testamentary—Execution. —— Under Wisconsin law, an authority given to the executor to sell land and convert it into money must be executed by all, and equity will not enforce a contract of sale made by two only —— Crowley v. Hicks, S. C. Wis., Oct. 8, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 151.

154. PRACTICE—Parties — Assignment. — Where a bond is assigned to A at the instance and request of B,

who pays the consideration, A holds it in trust for B, and a subsequent assignee occupies the same relation and is the real party in interest to sue on the bond.—
Grant v. Heverin, S. C. Cal., Oct. 24, 1883; 19 Pac. Rep. 493.

155. PRACTICE—Verdict—General or Special.— Under Colorado law, in an action for the recovery of money only, it is a matter within the discretion of the jury as to whether they shall render a general or special verdict. — Thompson v. Gregor, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 461.

156. PRINCIPAL AND AGENT—Power—Insurance.—A general district agent of an insurance company for a stated territory, whose duties are to solicit and forward applications for insurance at a stated compensation, has no authority to bind the company for furniture purchased for his office. — Beebe v. Equitable M. L. & E. Ass., S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 122.

157. Public Lands—State Lands—Navigable Waters—Land Commissioners. — Under the statute of New York, the land commissioners may grant so much public land lying under navigable waters as they may think required for the uses of commerce. An appeal from the judgment of the supreme court relating to such grants to the court of appeals may be taken by the commissioner, but not by the successful party.— People v. Jones, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 9, 1898; 18 N. E. Rep. 482.

158. RAILROADS—Lease—Liability.—— A railroad company cannot, by leasing its road, avoid liability to shipper of freight for loss, caused by fire at a depot, where no authority for such lease is conferred by statute.—International, etc. R. R. v. Moody, S. C. Tex., Oct. 30, 1885: 9 S. W. Ren. 465.

159. RAILROAD COMPANIES — Bridges. — A railroad company cannot be required, under the laws of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across a deep cut to enable the owner of the land the more easily to reach the highway. — Traut v. New York, etc. Co., S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 678.

180. RAILROAD COMPANIES—Killing Stock— Measure of Damages.——Where a railroad company had engaged to place a cattle-guard upon plaintiff's premises, he may maintain an action for the value of cattle killed by reason of the failure of a compony to maintain such cattle-guard. In such case the measure of damages is the value of cattle so killed.— Chicago, etc. Co. v. Barnes, S. C. Ind., Nov. 10, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 459.

161. RAILROAD COMPANY—Lease — Injury to Property.
— Construction of a lease of a railway and appearement lands including such as might thereafter be acquired and used as depot grounds, etc. Held, that this lease did not include lands afterwards condemned but not put to use as depot grounds, and that the city was liable for injuries done to such lands by lowering the grade of an adjacent street.—Norwich, etc. Co. v. City of Worcester, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 19, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 409.

162. RECEIVER—Recovery of Property—Pleading.
Where a receiver files a petition, alleging that the officers of the company are about to dispose of, and convert to their own use a note belonging to the company, and are insolvent, which petition is entitled as though it were a part of the original action, the court can require defendants to answer and to surrender the note.

— Brandt v. Allen, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 26, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 82.

163. REFERENCE—Exceptions—Jury Trial.——A jury trial on exception to all the findings of the referee on the issues of fact, where there was a compulsory reference, is properly denied, under North Carolina law.—
Yelverton v. Coley, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 672.

164. RELEASE — Damages — Consideration. — An agreement by an injured employee to receive in satisfaction for both wages and damages the wages due him, concerning which there is no dispute, is without consideration, so far as it purports to release the claim for damages.—Cariton v. Western & A. R. R., S. C. Ga., Oct. 5, 1886; 7 S. E. Rep. 623.

165. REVIEW-Weight of Evidence. The finding of

the trial court will not be disturbed on appeal where there is evidence to sustain it. — McCallister v. Sigler, S. C. Ind., Nov. 13, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 464.

166. RIPARIAN RIGHTS — Diverting Water. — The owner of land on the bank of a stream may have an action against one who fills up the channel at the upper end of an island opposite, so as to throw the water on the other side of the Island. — Fulmer v. Williams, S. O. Penn., Oct. 8, 1888; IS Alt. Rep. 726.

167. SALE—Approval — Waiver. —— Circumstances stated under which it was held that one who had bought a reaper upon approval and without returning it kept and used it for a second harvest, thereby waived his right to return it. But where the vendor induced the vendee to retain the machine another year and promised to make it work he thereby waived his right of notice that it was defective.—In re Road in Raipho Tp., S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1885; 15 Atl. Rep. 725.

168. SALE—Change of Possession.——A, the mortgagor of hay, hauled it to a warehouse at the request of B, the mortgagee, in whose name it was stored, and afterwards A transferred it to B by bill of sale: Held, that the transfer was sufficient, under California law, as to the creditors of A. — Byrnes v. Hatch, S. C. Cal., Oct. 23, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 482.

169. SALES—Conditional—Transfers.—— A conditional sale of personal property is not subject to the mortagage acts, and the owner of the projecty can recover it from a vendee of the purchaser having knowledge of the terms and conditions thereof.—Gerowv. Castello, S. C. Colo., Oct. 26, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 505.

170. SALE—Execution. —— Where a retailer ordered goods from a wholesale merchant, and after selling part of them returned the remainder to the vendor which the latter refused to accept: Heid, that the title to the goods so returned was in the purchaser and liable to execution for his debts. — Freedman v. Morrow, etc. Co., S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 690.

171. SCHOOL—School-districts—Negligence.——School-districts in Pennsylvania are merely agents of the commonwealth, and cannot be held liable for the negligence of their employees.— Ford v. School-district, etc. Co., S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1889; 15 Atl. Rep. 812.

172. SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—Devise to Vendee.

A contracted to buy land from B, who died before any conveyance was made, devising the land to A and another. A assented to the devise: Held, that A was relieved from his obligation to B.—Taylor v. Hargrove, B. C. N. Car., Oct. 15, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 647.

173. STARE DECISIS — Supreme Court Decisions.

Where this court has decided a question, and parties have transacted important affairs relying upon such ruling as a settled rule of law, such ruling will be adhered to, though the court might hold otherwise if the question were res integra.— Paulson v. City of Portland, S. C. Oreg., July 2, 1883; 19 Pac. Rep. 450.

174. STREETS—Street Railway — Defective Street.—
In an action against a street railway company for Injuries caused by a depression between the rails of the railway, the defendant is entitled to an instruction that, if the injury was caused by the city, or by private persons, it is not liable therefor. — Citizens' Pass. Ry. Co. v. Ketcham, S. C. Penn., Oct. 29, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 733.

175. SURETY—Indorsement—Non-negotiable Paper.—Where one, not the payee of a non-negotiable note, writes his name on the back of it, he incurrs the liability of a surety of the maker.—*Pool v. Anderson*, S. C. Ind., Oct. 23, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 445.

176. Taxation — Assessment — Assessor — Vacancy — Statute. — Construction of New Jersey statutes relative to the assessment of property for taxation. Proceedings when the office of assessor of a city or town is vacant. — Township of Eastentown v. Board of Assessor, S. C. N. J., Nov. 12, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 830.

177. Taxation—Borough—Collection—Counsel.

Construction of Pennsylvania statutes relative to the collection of taxes, the election of tax collectors and the application of those statutes to taxes levied by

boroughs and councils, and the collection thereof by subordinate collectors. — Appeal of Town Council, S. C. Penn., Oct. 29, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 730.

178. Taxation— Exemptions—Charities.——Under Georgia law, a poor house, when erected, is exempt from taxation, but detached property, from which its support is to be derived, is not exempt.—Trustees of Academy v. Bohler, S. C. Ga., Nov. 15, 1887; 7 S. E. Rep. 633.

179. TAXATION—Exemption — Masonic Building.

Conceding that the grand lodge of Georgia is a purely
public charity, the most it can claim is that the part of
its temple not used for profit shall be spared from taxation. — Massenbury v. Grand Lodge, S. C. Ga., June 1,
1888; 7 S. E. Bep. 636.

180. Taxation — Property of Deceased Persons.

Under Michigan law, the personal property of an estate shall be assessed to the executor in the town where the deceased last resided, until notice be given that the estate is distributed. — Avery v. Dewitt, S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 39.

181. Taxation—Sales—Separate Tracts. ——A certificate of tax-sale construed as showing on its face that several distinct tracts of land were sold together for one gross sum and, therefore, held void. — *Brown v. Setzer*, S. C. Minn., Nov. 2, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 70.

182. TAXATION—Standing Timber.——Standing timber, owned separately from the land, is to be assessed, under Michigan laws, as realty.—Fletcher v. Town of Alcona, S. C. Mich., Oct. 19, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 36.

183. TRESPASS TO TRY TITLE—Improvements.——Defendant in trespass to try title cannot be allowed his claim for improvements, under Texas law, when plaintiff and defendant claim under the same immediate source of title, and defendant took possession, but about two months before the action was brought.—Whitaker v. Allday, S. C. Tex., Oct. 30, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 483.

184. TROVER AND CONVERSION — Husband and Wife — Evidence. ——A warehouseman who has surrendered to the executors of a husband property sto ed with him by the wife, may set up against her the title of the husband. In such case a widow cannot testify as to transactions with her husband.—Mulling v. Chickering, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 16, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 377.

185. TRUST—Attorney and Client—Fees. —— Circumstances stated under which it was held that, where an engagement is made with an attorney to transact the professional business of the plaintiff, and he does so for many years, attending to their affairs during complicated litigation, and discharging the duties of trustee under a trust deed involving the property in question, he is entitled to fees for his services during the whole series of transaction, and the liability of the plaintiff for h's fees was not interrupted or modified by the trust.—Babcock v. Hubbard, S. C. E. Conn., June 26, 1888; 15 Atl. Red. 79.

186. TRUST—Constructive Trust—Attorney and Client.
—An attorney, who in the course of his professional employment, discovers a flaw in his client's title to property, and buys up the outstanding title, cannot maintain an action against his client, because he holds the title under a constructive trust for the benefit of his client.
—Downard v. Hadley, S. C. Ind., Nov. 10, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 467.

187. TRUSTS—Grantee—Consideration. — A trust results in favor of one who pays the consideration for land, which is deeded to another, and his right to recover the title and possession is not dependant upon an express agreement of the latter to convey to him. — Burns v. Ross, S. C. Tex., Oct. 23, 1886; 9 S. W. Rep. 468.

188. TRUSTS—Resulting—Bona Fide Purchasers.——In an action to establish a resulting trust in land sold for taxes, and to recover the land or its value, no relief can be had against a purchaser for value and without notice of plaintiff's claim from the sheriff's vendee.—Richardson w. Haney, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 29, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 115.

189. TRUST—Will—Construction—Estate. —— A devise to trustees directing them to pay the income to the beneficiary, a widow, who has no apparent intention of

marriage, creates a mere passive trust, and if there is no limitation over, e-titles the widow to an absolute conveyance.—Appeal of Rodrigue, S. C. Penn., Oct, 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 680.

190. WATER AND WATER-COURSES — Ponds. — The "Colony Ordinance," 1641-47 (Ancient Charters and Laws, 148), providing that householders shall have free fishing and fowling in any great ponds, bay, etc., within the precincts of the town, and may pass and repass on foot through any man's land, so that they trespass not on corn or meadow land, and that no town shall appropriate any great pond to any particular person, establishes a rule of property throughout the State of Massachusetts, vesting in it both the jus privatum and jus publicum, in the great ponds, and the legislature can appropriate their waters to public uses, without making compensation to owners of land on natural streams flowing therefrom. — Watuppa, etc. Co. v. City of Fall River, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 29, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 465.

191. WILL—Attestation—Execution.——The attesting witnesses of a will must sign the attestation clause in the presence of the testator, and must then see the testator's signature. It is not sufficient if they sign the clause without seeing the signature, although he tells them that the paper is his will.—In re Mackay's Will, N. Y. Ct. App., Oct. 26, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 433.

192. WILL—Construction—Validity—Remoteness—Where a testator bequeathed the rents and profits of an estate to N for life, and after her death to her children for life, and as her children should die the estate to go to the heirs at law of N, as each child shall die after the death of N his proportion shall go to his children, said N's grandchildren to take per stirpes: Held, that the limitation over to the grandchildren of N was not void for remoteness, but that the estate vested in the grandchildren who were living at the death of the testator, subject to the life interest of N, and that upon the death of any one of the grandchildren, after the testator's death and the death of N, his share should be divided among his heirs at law. — Dorr v. Lovering, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 22, 1888; 18 N. E. Rep. 412.

193. WILL—Divise—Shelley's Case. ——A devise to a daughter during her natural life, and after her death to the begotten heirs or heiresses of her body, creates an estate-tail, which, under North Carolina law, is a feesimple.—Leathers v. Gray, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 15, 1888; 7 S. E. Bep. 667.

194. WILL—Estate—Accumulation.——A will granting an estate to the testator's daughter and providing that the interest should be left to accumulate during the life of her husband, vests in her an absolute estate in the funds and its accumulations at the expiration of twenty-one years after the testator's death.—Appeal of Brubaker, S. C. Penn., Oct. 1, 1888; 15 Atl. Rep. 708.

195. WILLS—Execution — Witness. —— Under North Carolina law, an attesting witness, who is also an heir at law and propounder of the will, may testify in his own behalf as to its validity. — Collins v. Collins, S. C. N. Car., Oct. 22, 1888; 7 S. E. Rep. 687.

196. WILL—Witness—"His Mark."——Under the statute law of Arkansas (Mansf. Dig. § 6344), which authorizes the signature by mark of a witness to a will, who cannot write his name, the mark of an attesting witness is valid if proved by the person who wrote the signature to which the mark io attached, although such person has not signed his own name as witness of the fact that the attesting witness had made his mark. — Davis v. Semmers, S. C. Ark., Oct. 27, 1888; 9 S. W. Rep. 434.

197. WITNESS—Contradictory Statements. — A party may on direct examination, for the purpose of refreshing the recollection of his witness, inquire if he has not at another time testified to facts inconsistent with his present testimony.—State v. Cummins, S. C. Iowa, Oct. 30, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 124.

198. WRIT-Return-Error. —— An officer's return of a warrant is no part of the record, and the mistake therein is no ground for arrest of judgment. — Commonwealth v. Russell, S. J. C. Mass., Oct. 22, 1888; 18 N. E. Bep. 418.

199. WRITS—Return—Impeachment.—The return of an officer of the service of a summons is not conclusive upon the defendant, but may be impeached by affidavit upon motion or other direct proceedings in the action to set aside the judgment or default.—Crosby v. Farmer, S. C. Minn., Nov. 2, 1888; 40 N. W. Rep. 71.

200. WRITS—Service — Return. — Under Colorado laws, a return dated at the office of the sheriff of the county of defendant's residence, stating that the summons was served personally by delivering a copy to defendant, and signed by the sheriff by his deputy, is sufficient.—Thomas v. Colorado N. Bank, S. C. Colo., Oct. 16, 1888; 19 Pac. Rep. 501.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

| Correspondents are requested to draw up their answers in the form in which we print them, and not in the form of letters to the editor. They are also admonished to make their answers as brief as may be.—Ed.]

QUERY No. 15.

A and B agreed to run a horse race for \$500 a side, the winner to take the whole. The race was run. A's horse won. After the race, but before the money was paid over by C (the stakeholder), B demanded his \$500; C refused to pay to him, but paid the whole \$1,000 to the winner, A. B brought suit against C, the stakeholder, to recover his \$500. C answered, setting up the above facts, and alleged that B agreed to abide the decision of the judges of the race; that the race was won by A, and was so decided by said judges, and after said decision in A's favor, C held the money when B's demand was made, as the money of A. To this answer B demurred. The circuit court at Portland, Oreg., sustained the demurrer, holding "that, notwithstanding the statutes of Oregon are silent on the subject, the 'wager' is illegal, and contrary to public policy. That demand being made before the money was actually paid over, though after the event, B could recover." Please cite authorites holding: 1st. That in the absence of any statute to that effect, the "wager" is not illegal or against public policy. 2d. That after the event (i. e., after the race was run and decided), it is loo late to rescind or recover the money staked and lost. On the second proposition New York, Texas and California have so held as to election bets. N. H. B.

QUERIES ANSWERED.

QUERY No. 13 [27 Cent. L. J. 564.]

A plaintiff in trespass introduced a land contract showing that he had an equitable title, and is to get a warranty deed upon making certain monthly payments aggregating \$1,500. Subsequently on the trial he offered a warranty deed of the same property, between the same parties, but bearing date on a day subsequent to the commencement of the action. The form of the complaint in alleging title is the same as in ejectment cases, i. e., the plaintiff alleged himself to be the owner and entitled to the possession. It had appeared on the trial previous to this offer, that the land upon which the trespass was committed was a vacant lot. The warranty deed was objected to upon the ground that only facts which were in existence at the time of the commencement of the action were admissible. The court received the deed, stating that he did so with some hesitation, but because the contract already in evidence showed that the plaintiff had sufficient interest in the land to maintain the action, and the only

further question to consider was whether the owner of the legal title would have a remedy against the defendant in addition to the one the plaintiff claimed on this title; and that this deed conferring the whole title in the plaintiff was relevant and material. Was the court right? Cite authorities. R.

Answer. It was formerly held that an action of trespass could only be maintained in case the plaintiff was in actual possession of the land when the trespass was committed. Afterwards the owner of unoccupied land was considered to be in constructive possession, and was allowed to bring such a suit. But a cestuique trust or a bargainee, not in possession, cannot bring such a suit. Carrine v. Westerfield, 3 A. K. Marsh. 331; 1 Chitty Pl. 71; 6 Wait's Act. & Def. 64-68. The plaintiff, not being in possession, nor the owner of the land when the suit was brought, cannot maintain his action.

J. E. B.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

FEDERAL DECISIONS. Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme, Circuit and District Courts of the United States. Comprising the Opinions of those Courts from the Time of their Organization to the Present Date, together with Extracts from the Opinions of the Court of Claims and the Attorneys-General, and the Opinions of General Importance of the Territorial Courts. Arranged by William G. Myer, Author of an Index to the United States Supreme Court Reports; also Indexes to the Reports of Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, Missouri and Tennessee, a Digest of the Texas Reports, and local works on Pleading and Practice. Vol. XXVII. Quantum Meruit—Swamp Lands. St. Louis, Mo.: The Gilbert Book Company. 1888.

We have now before us the twenty-seventh volume of "Federal Decisions," which in all respects is equal to any of its predecessors. We have so often commented on the successive volumes of this series that there is absolutely nothing new to say in commendation of the present issue. We can only repeat what we have so often said, that the collection is one of the most important and valuable that has ever been made; that the-work upon it has been done in a style worthy of it, and that the legal profession ought to be under lasting obligations to the editor and publishers of so valuable a compendum of law.

JETSAM AND FLOTSAM.

"PRISONER at the bar," remarked a judge to a forsaken criminal who was about to receive his death sentence, "Is there anything you wish to say before sentence is passed upon you?" The prisoner cast a look at the half-open door as he said: "I would like to say 'Good-evening,' if it's agreeable to the company."

SOLICITOR CURRAN, the famous Irish advocate, was once examining a witness who persistently avoided direct answers. Livid with rage, the Irishman declared: "That'll do; that'll do. There's no use asking you questions, for I see the villian in your face." "Oh, do you, now, sir," tauntingly replied the witness. "Faix, I never knew before that my face was a looking-glass."

INDEX TO VOLUME 27.

In this index all the principal matters are referred to in the volume except those embraced in the Weekly Digest of Recent Cases, to which a separate index has been made, which will be found on page 626. Besides the customary abbreviations, the following are used: ann. cas.-annonated cases; C. E.—Current Events; R. D.—Notes of Recent Decisions; Q. A.—Queries Answered; L. A.— Leading Article.

ABSCONDING DEBTOR.

An oral promise of a creditor of an absconding debtor to pay another creditor of the same debtor, if he will not attach the property of the debtor, is within the statute of funds, Stewart v. Jerome, ann.

cas, 428.
ABUSIVE LANGUAGE—EXCITING PREJUDICE.
See argument to juries in criminal cases, L. A. 85.
ABUTTING LOT OWNER.
See municipal corporation, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann.

See municipal corporation, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann. cass, 114.

ABUTTING PROPRIETORS.
See assessment, R. D. 110.
an abutting proprietor is estopped from objecting to a public improvement by having stood by in silence and received the benefit of it, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann. cas. 114.
comments on the abuses of powers to assess abutting proprietors, C. E. 349.
delegated powers of taxation, C. E. 349.
ACCEPTANCE.
See religious societies. State v. Bibb St. Church, ann.

ACCEPTANCE.
See religious societies, State v. Bibb St. Church, ann. cas. 216,
ACCEPTANCE BY MAIL.
See contract, Wilcox v. Cline, ann. cas. 574,
ACCEPTING AND RELECTING BIDS.
See municipal corporation, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann.

cas. 114. ACCIDENT INSURANCE.

See Insurance.
See Insurance, R. D. 158.
ACCORD AND SATISFACTION.
See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.
ACCOUNTING.

See insurance, Uhlman v. New York, etc. Co. ann. cas.

389.
ACOUSED AS A WITNESS.
a statement of the statutes and the decisions authorizing the examination of a person accused of crime as a witness in his own behalf, L. A. 328.
ACQUIESCENCE.

See estoppel, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 503.

ACTS AFTER TITLE ACQUIRED.

See what constitutes adverse possession, Riggs v.

Riley, ann. cas. 87.

ACTION.

ACTION.

an action for obstructing water which has overflowed from a river accrues when the overflow takes place, and not when the obstruction is made, Sullens v. Chicago etc. Co. ann. cas. 482.

See malpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
ACTION-PENDENCY OF ACTION IN ANOTHER STATE. See foreign judgments, L. A. 391.
ACTION FOR FOULING STREAMS. L. A. 35.
ADMERSE POSSESSION.

Ilmitations of actions, adverse possession for twenty years will suffice to defeat a action of ejectment by one who has only the paper title, Riggs v. Riley, ann. cas. 87.

AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES.

AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES. AGEENTS AND EMPLOYEES, law relating to agents and employees of railroads, see railroads, L. A. 35. AGREEMENT RELATING TO LAND. See fraud, R. D. 399. Peck v. Peck, ann. cas. 479. AGREEMENT TO SELL.

negotiation preliminary to contract. See transaction resembing sales, L. A. 136.

AGREEMENT TO SELL AND BUY. See transactions resembling sales, L. A. 136.

ALIENATION-RESTRICTIONS UPON. See trust, R. D. 280.

from all participation in its benefits all purchasers from, or creditors of the object of his bounty, R. D.

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE.

See summary proceedings, C. E. 541. strictures upon the practice of permitting alternative service of process. See summary proceedings, C. E. 541.

AMENDMENT.

MENDMENT.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis etc.
Co., ann. cas. 454
where a proceeding by mandamus are had against
two railroad companies, it is not error to permit an
amendment to the information so as to make one of
the companies a party to the proceedings against
the other, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis etc. Co. ann.
cas. 454

the other, minicapois v. same process.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION.

notice of the recent meeting of this body in August, 1888, and of some of its officers, C. E. 422.

list of officers of the American bar associations, corr.

AMERICAN DECISIONS.

488.

AMERICAN DECISIONS.
edited by A. C. Freeman, review of, R. P. 28, 228.

AMERICAN STATE REPORTS.
edited by A. C. Freeman, review of, R. P. 276, 492,

AMERICAN STATUTE LAW.
by Frederic J. Stinson, review of, R. P. 80.

ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACT.

Where a party induces a woman to marry him upon an agreement to settle upon her certain lands, but before the marriage conveyed the lands to his son, and soon afterwards deserted his wife, it was held, that an action by the son to dispossess her could not be maintained, and that the statute of frauds did not apply, Peck v. Peck, ann. cas. 479.

APPEAL.
See attorney's lien, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191.
a court can consider on appeal only the questions raised by the record, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 283.

APLICATION.
See insurance, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas.

ee insurance, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas

See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

ARBITRATION.

arbitration clause, fire insurance, proviso suing before arbitration, condition precedent, Viney v. Bignold, ann. cas. 40.

insurance, policy, condition precedent. Where a policy of insurance contains a stipulation that all matters of difference shall be referred to arbitration, and that no action at law shall be maintained, except upon the award of arbitrators: Held, that an award is a condition precedent to plaintiff's right of action, Viney v. Bignold, ann. cas. 40.

ARBITRATION AND AWARD.

choice of arbitrator by lot, waiver of opinion, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas. 332.

choice of arbitrator by lot, waiver of opinion, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas. 332.

ARBITRATION CLAUSE.
See arbitration, Viney v. Bignold, ann. cas. 40.

ARBITRATOR.
ruling as to choice of a third arbitrator, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas. 332.

ARGUMENT OF COUNSEL.
reason why they should not be inserted in legal reports. See legal reporting, etc. C. E. 133.

ARGUMENT TO JURY IN CRIMINAL CASES. L. A. 82.

ARREST.

the rule as to arrest upon foreigh contracts under the lex fori, L. A. 255.

ASSAULT AND BATTERY, malice, damages, compensatory; damages, exem-plary, R. D. 303. ASSESSMENT.

Sobstant.

city improvements, abutting proprietors; notice, constitutional law, R. D. 110.

See mulcipal corporation, Garvin v. Dausmann, ann.

See municipal corporation, Galvin v. Dandham, Cas. 312.

ASSIGNEE—FOREIGN.
See powers of foreign involuntary assignee, L. A. 111.

ASSIGNEE—INVOLUNTARY. See powers of foreign involuntary assignees, L. A. 111.
See transaction.

See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.
ASSIGNMENT AS TRANSFER.
of incorporate personalty. See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.
ASSUMPSIT.

See vendor and vendee, R. D. 327. ATTACK.

ATTACK.
attacking foreign judgments, L. A. 591.
See contract, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas, 191.
ATTORNEY'S LIEN.
an attorney's lien on the fund is paramount, the claims of all others interested, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas.

ATTORNEY-SERVICE OF NOTICE ON.

ATTORNET—SERVICE OF NOTICE ON.
See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495.
ATTORNEY—SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY.
rule as to the signature of attorneys to be appended
to a summons. See summons, L. A. 527.
ATTORNEY—AUTHORITY TO APPEAR.
See foreign judgment, L. A. 591.
ATTORNET—SEE
priority, errors, record, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas.
191.

AUTHORITY OF AGENT. See principal and agent, Milne v. Kleb, ann. cas. 383. AVERAGE.

AVERAGE.
See water and water-courses, Sullens v. Chicago etc.
Oo. ann cas. 432.
BACON, FREDERICK H.
author of treatise on benefit societies, R. P. 540.
BAILMENT.

BAILMENT.
See limitation of action, R. D. 423.
the statute of limitataion does not begin to run in case
of a bailment of an article left for repairs until after
demand of its return has been made, R. D. 423.
BANKS AND BANKING.
national banks, taxation, exemption by charter, R. D.

BANKRUPTCY.

BANKRUPTCY.
See conflict of laws, In re Peck, ann. cas. 188.
BANKRUPTOY—INSOLVENCY.
a conveyance of property by a bankrupt or insolvent is determined by the law of the place where the property is situated, not by the law of the domicile, In re Peck, ann. cas. 188.
BARGAINS—TRANSFERRING CHATTELS.
See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.
BEACH, CHARLES FISK.
author of a manuel of the law of wills, R. P. 588.
BENEFIT SOCIETIES—TREATISE ON.
Fr-derick H Bacon, review of, R. P. 540.
BREACH.
See contract in restraint of trade, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.

See contract in restraint of trade, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.

BRIDGES.

a railroad company may be required to bridge its track when necessary, although it had been previously been constructed upon the grade of the street, Minneapolis etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.

See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis etc. Co. ann cas. 454.

BONA FIDE HOLDER OF NEGOTIABLE PAPER. notice from the face of the instrument, etc. L. A. by Wm. M. Rockel, 189.

BONA FIDE PURCHASER. what is necessary to constitute one bons fide pur-

that is necessary to constitute one bona fide pur-chaser, L. A. 159.

BONHAM, JOHN M. author of industrial liberty, R. P. 396,

BOUNDARY.

See estoppel, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 503.
BOYCOTTING.

Boycotting" is a misdemeanor at common law, R. D. 350. intimidation, injunction, R. D. 350. BUILDING.

See eminent domain, Forney v. Fremont etc. Co. ann.

BURDEN OF PROOF.
See slander, R. D. 54.
See guardian and ward, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann.
cas. 476.
OARE.
degree of care required in the acquisition of peroti-

degree of care required in the acquisition of negoti-able paper by a bona fide holder, L. A.163.

CAR-LOAD CASES. See interstate commerce, C. E. 253.

CAR-LOAD CASES.

comments on cases pending before the interstate commerce commission known as "car-load cases," and involving the right of a carrier to discriminate in their charges between large and small shipments of goods, C. E. 255.

CARRIFE.
negligence; contributory negligence, R. D. 518.

CARRIER PASSENGER.
a passenger on a car who is standing on a platform and is thrown down and injured by the starting of the car, is guilty of contributory negligence, he ought not to have been on the platform, and cannot recover damages, R. D. 518.

CARRIERS. CARRIERS

CARRIERS.
of passenger goods, law relating to such carriers.
See rulicoads, L. A. 352.
ASSETTACED.
SEET TEST.
GESTUT QUE TRUST.
See trust, Weaver v. Akin, ann. cas. 357.
CESTUT QUE TRUST.
Power. The cestal que trust has no power in Michigan to incumber the trust estate, nor has the trustee except as authorized by statute, although he holds the legal and equitable estate, Weaver v. Akin, ann. cas. 357.

cas. 357.
CHAMPERTY.
comments on the law of champerty and its application to conditional fees and other like contracts,
C. E. 373.
Conditional fees, C. E. 373, 445.
CHANCERY REPORTS.
of New York, edited by Robert Desty, review of, R. P. 324.
CHANEY, G. R.
author of Nebraska citations, R. P. 180.
CHANGE IN CHARACTER OF TRUST FUND.
action on executor's bond, misappropriations, interest, rate, Cranson v. Wilsey, ann. cas. 240.
CHARACTER.
bad. See libel, C. E. 109.
CHARITABLE GIFTS.
incorporation, dissolution, failure to execute deed,
Bates v. Palmetto Society, ann. cas. 143.
CHARTER.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis

See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis etc. Co., ann. cas. 464.
CHIEF JUSTICE.
See Mr. Justice Fuller, C. E. 61.
CHINESE.

See naturalization law. C. E. 325. CHOICE OF ARBITRATOR BY LOT. See arbitration and award, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas.

CHRISTMAS.

comes but once a year, C. E. 589. CITY IMPROVEMENTS.

ee assessment, R. D. 110. TL LIABILITY OF PHYSICIANS FOR MALPRACTICE,

L. A. 567. CLAIRVOYANT.

EalityOTANT.

See malpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548. clairvoyans physicians do not constitute a school of medicine as that term is used in legal proceedings, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548. LASSES.

CLASSES.
of foreign judgments, L. A. 591.
COCHRAN, WILLIAM.
See author of Student's Law Dictionary, R. P. 420.
COLLATERAL ATTACK.
See judgment, R. D. 336;
See judgment, Shryock v. Buckman, ann. cas. 481.
COMMERCIAL LAW
what is reasonable time in commercial cases L. A. 377.

COMMERCIAL TRAVELER.
See innkeeper's lien, Covington v. Newberger, ann.

cas. 263.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.
factor and broker, principal and agent, instructions
to principal, cause, proximate and remote, warehouse receipts, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann. cas. 380.

COMPENSATION.

See eminent domain, Forney v. Fremont, ann. cas. 8. for services, sale or payment, see transaction resembling sale, L. A. 136.
COMPENSATORY.

See assault and battery, R. D. 303. CONCLUSIVENESS OF FOREIGN JUDGMENTS.

L. A. 591. CONDITION.

CONDITION.
escrow, title. The title to property by a deed in escrow does not pass to the gtantee until the condition is performed, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas 138.
CONDITION IN POLICY.
See fire insurance, Sierra, etc. Co. v. Hartford etc. Co., ann. cas. 451.
CONDITION PRECEDENT.
See arbitration, Viney v. Bignold, ann. cas. 40.

CONDITIONAL FEES.
See champerty, C. E. 378.
remarks upon the subject of conditional fees where
the client is poor or lacks faith in the validity of his
claim, C. E. 445.
CONDITIONAL SALES.
treatise on, by Charles R. Miller, review of, R. P. 468.
CONFESSION.

the judge must decide whether threats or promises are made where such as to exclude an alleged ques-

are mane where such as to exclude an anleged ques-tion, L. A. S. CONFLICT OF LAWS. bankruptcy, insolvency, proceedings for receiver, jury trial. In re Peck, ann. cas. 188. CONSIDERATION.

ONSIDERATION.
of sales, see transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136;
bons fide holder must acquire his title to negotiable
paper for a valuable consideration, L. A. 160.
See specific performance, [Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas.

See fraudulent conveyance, Fratherstone v. Dagnall,

236.
See fraudulent conveyance, Fratherstone v. Dagnall, ann. cas. 544.
CONSOLIDATION OF ACTIONS.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.
CONSOLIDATION OF CAUSES.
Where proceeding of a like character are pending against two railroad companies to compel them to bridge their respective tracks, it is not error to require that both causes should be heard together, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, swearing a judge off the bench, C. E. 58.
recent rulings on assessments for public improvements and the liability of abutting proprietors therefor, R. A. 110.
See assessment, R. D. 110.
taxation, a telegraph company which has accepted the act of congress of 1866, cannot be required by the State to pay a tax on messages sent by the government, or from one State to another, Leloup v. Port of Mobile, ann. cas. 119.
interstate commerce in any form, Leloup v. Port of Mobile, ann. cas. 119.
See election and voters, R. D. 422.
suits against states, federal courts, jurisdiction, R. D. 494.
habeas corpus, interstate commerce, drummer's tax,

habeas corpus, interstate commerce, drummer's tax, R. D. 566.

See corporation, R. D. 590. CONSTRUCTION.

CONSTRUCTION.
the construction of negotiable paper and its incidents is a question for the court, L. A. 161.
See will, R. D. 392.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc Co., ann. cas. 454.
CONSTRUCTION OF COMPANY.
See insurance, De Graff v. Queen Ins. Co., ann, cas. 281.

CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE. See notice, L. A. 161. CONTEMPT OF COURT.

ONTEMPT OF COURT.
See summary proceedings, C. E. 541.
remarks upon proceedings in cases of contempt of court. See summary proceedings, C. E. 541.
jurisdiction, R. D. 542.
a court has jurisdiction to order summarily without summons or hearing the imprisonment of one who is guilty of contempt committed in its presence, R. D. 542. CONTRACTS

D. 542.

ONTRACTS.

See international law, R. D. 30.

where a contract does not specify the time of payment a reasonable time will be implied, L. A. 108.

See religious societies, R. D. 135.

the essential elements of contract. See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.

a contract for building on lands granted to voluntary association is a legal obligation which may be enforced at law, Bates v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 143.

attorney, judgment. An attorney's lien under a contract is prior to a judgment against his client, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191.

See equity, R. D. 298.

See equity, R. D. 298.

See equity, R. D. 298.

What is reasonable time in performing contracts, L. A. 378.

written contract, parol evidence to vary. Where there is a written contract to deliver lumber and

A. 378.

written contract, parol evidence to vary. Where there is a written contract to deliver lumber and a parol contract that the vendor shall be satisfied of the solvency of the vendee, the sale being upon credit, the written contract is varied by the parol contract, and it is held that the vendor must be satisfied of the solvency of the vendee before he can be held bound to perform his engagement, R. D. 471. between physician apd patient. What it implies. See malpractice, L. A. 567. option, acceptance by mall, Wilcox v. Cline, ann. cas.

CONTRACTS-Continued.

option, acceptance. Where an offer is made for the sale of land with an option of the purchaser to accept or reject within a limited time, an acceptance by mall received by the vendor within that time will render the contract absolute, Wilcox v. Cline, ann. cas. 574.

telegraph company, telegram, fictitious address, Miliken v. Western Union Tel. Co. ann. cas. 577. CONTRACT FOR PURCHASE OF LAND. See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 498.

CONTRACT IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE. physicians, practice, breach, same, time, French v. Farker, ann. cas. 527.

CONTRACT SALE OF CHATTELS.

See equity, R. D. 82.

CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE.

See negligence, R. D. 374.

See carrier, R. D. 518.

See municipal corporation, Burmingham v. McCary, ann cas. 598.

the question whether the plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence in falling at night into an unguarded, unlighted ditch is a question for the jury, Birmingham v. McCary, ann. cas. 598.

CONVEYANCE.

See ejectment, R. D. 254.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

See wife beating, O. E. 157.

CORPORATION.

See libel, R. D. 3.

Private corporations, treatise on the law of, by Henry

See libel, R. D. 3.
private corporations, treatise on the law of, by Henry
O. Taylor, R. P. 132.
dissolution. Upon the dissolution of a corporation
which was formed by a voluntary association, property received by that association reverts to its members and not to the original donoer, Bates v. Palmetto Society, ann. cas. 143.
the corporation cannot become a party to "trust,"
unless specially authorized to do so by its charter,
C. E. 205.
See trust, C. E. 205.
subscription, parties, Vanderwerken v. Gleen, ann
eas. 386.

subscription, parties, Vanderwerken v. Gleen, ann eas. 386.

liability of foreign corporation in case of interstate garnishment is the same as that of a domestic corporation, L. A. 728.

stockholders, C. E. 565.
effect upon the property of a corporation of a judicial decree disolving it, R. D. 590.

dissolution, constitutional law, trust, directors, trustees, R. D. 590.
comments upon the law relating to corporations, and especially the election of officers of such corporations, O. E. 565.

CORRESPONDENCE.
letter relating to the decision of a case in which the party had murdered his next of kin and his right to inherit the property of the decased came into question, corr. 27.

special legislation, comments of a correspondent on our article relating to special legislation, corr. 252.

CREDIBILITY.

of dying declarations, a question for the jury, L. A. 88.

notable decrease of crime in England. See decrease of crime, C. E. 301.
CRIMINAL CASES.
argument to jury in, L. A. 82.
CROSS-EXAMINATION.

KUSS-EXAMINATION.
of the party accused, L. A. 305.
for purposes of impeachment, L. A. 305.
questions affecting the credibility of the witness, L. A.
305.

305.

American rule on strict examination, L. A. 305.
sifting, modifying, extending, explaining the direct
examination, L. A. 365.
English rule on the whole case, L. A. 305.
how far subject to discretionary control, L. A. 305.
objects of, L. A. 305.

Objects of J. A. 305.
L. A. 305.
CROSSING.
ruling as to railway crossing in Minnesota, construction of statute on that subject, all railway crossings need not be at grade, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co., ann cas. 454.
COUNTERCLAIM.

See defense, L. A. 255. COUNTERS.

See equity, R. D. 2. COVENANT.

See deed, R. D. 279. CUSTOM.

See usage, L. A. 8.
See master and servant, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 263.

DAMAGES.

mitters.

mitigation of, see libel, C. E. 109.

one cannot recover damages for the breach of a cove-

DAMAGES—Continued.
nant of seizin, when he is himself in possession of
the land at the time of the alleged breach, R. D. 279.
assault, statement of the law relating to damages in
an action for assault. In such case, when the assault
is malicious the damages must be compensatory
and may be exemplary, R. D. 303.
See assault and battery, R. D. 303.
measure of damages, the measure of damages for
overflowing land by an obstruction is the difference
in value of the land before and after the obstruction
takes place, Sullens v. Chicago, etc. Co. ann. cas.
482.

432.

statute of Missouri, the statute of Missouri limits the amount of damages recoverable from a railroad for death caused by its negligence to \$5,000, there is no commonn law rule on the subject, Q. A. 564. rule of in malpractice cases, see malpractice, L. A. 567. exemplary, see assault and battery, R. D. 303.

DANGER.

unnecessary exposure to, when and how far one may expose himself to unnecessary danger without in-curring legal penalties, C. E. 277.

DEBT.
foreign judgments are simply evidence of debt, see
foreign judgments, L. A. 591.
DEBT OF INDIVIDUAL MEMBER.
See partnership, Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164.
DECREASE OF CRIME.
comments on the notably decrease of crime in Eng-

comments on the notably decrease of crime in Ang-land, C. E. 301.

DECLARATIONS.

evidence, the declaration of one partner cannot au-thorize the sale of firm property for the private debt of another (absent) partner, Williams v. Lewis, ann.

cas. 164. fraud, declarations showing fraud made by a vendor two weeks before the sale to a third person, of which the vendee had no notice, are not admissible in evidence, Rogers v. Thurston, ann. cas. 287.
see fraudulent conveyance, Rogers v. Thurston, ann.

cas. 287.
DECLARATIONS AND ADMISSIONS.
See partnership, Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164.
DECLARATIONS OF DONOR.
See gift inter vivos, Bennett v. Cook, ann. cas. 90.
DEED.

ONED.

if a deed for land sold is in possession of the grantor's agent, it has not been legally delivered, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 138. eovenant, seizin, R. D. 279. delivery, presumption, quieting title, diligence, R. D.

204.

DEED OF TRUST.
See fraud, Keagy v. Trout, ann. cas. 407.

DEFAULT.
judgment by, see summary proceedings, C. E. 541.

DEFENSE.

judgment by, see summary proceedings, C. E. 641.

DEFENSE.
defense arising from matter ex post facto, L. A. 255.

DELAY.
the laws delay, appearance term, continuance, statement of abuses still prevalent in some States growing out of the fact that in those States a defendant is entitled, as matter of right, to a continuance from the first to the second term after the service of process, C. E. 29.

DELIGATION OF POWERS.
See abutting proprietors, C. E. 349.

DELIYERY.
See gift inter vivos, Bennett v. Cook, ann. cas. 90.
gift, what will constitute a constructive delivery of a gift, Bennett v. Cook, ann. cas. 90.

DEPOSITIONS.
See fraudulent conveyance, Featherstone v. Dagnall, ann. cas. 544.
a deposition cannot be read in evidence unless it

ann. cas. 544.
a deposition cannot be read in evidence unless it appears to the court that some one of the statutory reasons for taking it existed, see fraudulent conveyance, Featherstone v. Dagnall, ann. cas. 544.
See malpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
DESCRIPTION.
See policy, De Graff v. Queen Ins. Co., ann. cas. 284.
DESTY.
Robert, editor of New York Chancery Reports, R. P. 224.

DEVISE.

The devisee of land, which the testator was bound to convey to another, cannot have its value paid to him out of property of which the testator died in-testate, Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas. 236.

DIGEST.
of English and American cases, review of, R. P. 516.
DILIGENCE.
See deed, R. D. 304.
DIRECTORS.

See corporation, R. D. 590. DISCHARGE.

under the doctrine of .ex fori, L. A. 255. DISORIMINATION. See interstate commerce, C. E. 253.

DISCRETION

judicial, C. E. 29.
of court, see perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495.
DISQUALIFICATION.

DISQUALIFICATION.
of arbitrator, the expression of opinion by a person
does not necessarily disqualify him from afterwards
acting as arbitrator on the subject, see arbitration
and award, Bruch v. Fisher, ann. cas. 332.
DISSENTING OFINIONS.
reason why they should not be inserted in legal reports, see legal reporting, etc., C. E. 133.
DISSOLUTION.
See charitable gift, Bates v. Palmetto Society, ann. cas.
143.

See corporation, R. D. 590. DIVORCE.

DIVORCE.
alimony, exemption, where, in Nebraska, a wife obtains a divorce and the court awards her all his personal property, he cannot set up his claim of exemption, although he is the head of the family and has minor children by a former marriage, L. A. 444.
DOCTRINE OF THE LEX FORT.

L. A. 255.
DUE PROCESS OF LAW.
See municipal corporation, Garvin v. Dausmann, ann.

cas. 312. DRUMMER'S TAX.

See constitutional law, R. D. 566. DYING DECLARATIONS.

PILOT DECLARATIONS.
the judge must decide whether alleged dying declarations were such, and whether admissible in evidence, L.A. 7.
when admissible, preliminary proof, their credibility a question for the jury, for what purpose admissible, L.A. 31.

L. A. 31. EASEMENT.

EASEMENT.
injunction, a mandatory injunction will be issued at the inception of a sult to protect an easement, Hodge v. Glese, ann. cas. 64.
abandonment, where one having an easement to take water from a particular spring by means of pipes, afterwards, by a written agreement with the proprietor, exchanges that privilege for a like right to take water from another spring and the further consideration of a sum of money and continues to use the latter spring for twenty years, neither he nor his heirs can set up a claim to the original easement, Snell v. Levitt, ann. cas. 552.
ECONOMY.
See wife beating, C. E. 167.

See wife beating, C. E. 187.
protest against undue economy in the administration
of justice, C. E. 187.
EJECTMENT.

JEUTMENT:
conveyance, pendente lite, R. D. 254.
conveyance pendente lite, in Alabama, a plaintiff
may convey his interest in the property sued for in
ejectment, pendente lite, the defendant cannot
plead such transfer puls darrien continuance, R. D.

see mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 498.
ELECTION.
See specific performance, Hunter v. Mills. ann. cas.

236.
ELECTION AND VOTERS.
qualification of voters, mormons, constitutional law,
legislative powers, R. D. 422.
ELLIOTT.
B. K. & W. F., authors of "The Work of the Advocate,"
R. P. 348.
EMINENT DOMAIN.

under the right of eminent domain no more private property can be taken than is necessary for the public use, Forney v. Fremont, etc. Co., ann. cas.

be the right of eminent domain gives the legislature power to take private property for public uses, and for those only, Forney v. Fremont, etc. Co., ann.

what may be taken under it, Forney v. Fremont, etc.

what may be taken under it, Furney v. Fremon, e.c., Co., ann. cas. 8. exercise of, by railroad company, what may be taken, compensation, building, when passes with land taken, Forney v. Fremont, etc. Co., ann. cas. 8. see the right of one railway company to condemn the property of another railway company under a general statutory power, L. A. 207.

EMPLOYEES.
See teleuranh companies. R. D. 255.

See telegraph companies, R. D. 255. ENFORCEMENT.

ENFORCEMENT.
See religious societies, R. D. 135.
EQUITY.
railroad company, counties, mandamus, subscription, stock, R. D. 2.
a court of equity will protect legal rights which are denied but are clear on facts which are not denied, Hodge v. Giese, ann. cas. 64.
contract for sale of chattels, specific performance, R. D. 82.

FOUITY-Continued.

QUITY—Continued.
specific performance, equity will enforce the specific
performance of a parol contract by which land was
given upon condition that the grantee should occupy
and improve it, which he did, Hunter v. Mills, ann.

specific performance will not be enforced under circumstances which render it inequitable, in such case parties will be left to their legal remedies, R. D. 278.

specific performance, contract, husband and wife, R.

see insurance, Uhlman v. New York, etc. Co., ann. cas. 360.

injunction, eminent domain, condemnation, R. D. 875. EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL. See estoppel, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 508. ERRORS.

ERRORS.
See attorney's lien, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191.
a physician is not liable for errors in judgment, see malpractice, L. A. 567.
ESCROW.
delivery, an escrow can only be delivered to a stranger, not to a grantee, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 138.
what constitutes, statute of frauds, undelivered instrument, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 138.
EXTINGUISHMENT.
See easement, Snell v. Levitt, ann. cas. 552.
ESTOPPEL.
See partnership. Williams v. Levit.

ESTOPPEL.

See partnership, Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164.
mistake, where an erroneous line between contermintous proprietors is established by mutual mistake and acquiesced in by both parties, the losing
proprietor and his beirs are estopped by their acquiescence and laches from establishing the true
line, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 503.
equitable estoppel, boundary, acquiescence, mistake,
feme covert, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 508.
EVIDENCE.

the index must decide questions of fact preliminary

reme covert, Gaidratth v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 508.

the judge must decide questions of fact preliminary
to the admission of evidence, L. A. 4.

the judge must decide whether evidence of acts not in
dispute is admissible to affect the facts that are in
dispute, L. A. 8.
gift, parol declarations of donor, if there is plenary
proof of the fact of a gift, is it not error to exclude
the declaration of the (deceased) donor controverting the gift, Bennett v. Cook, ann. cas. 90.
declarations, declarations made by a vendor to the
vendee, apart from the transaction in question,
are not admissible in evidence, they are competent,
however, if they are part of the res gestæ, Rogers
v. Thurston, ann. cas. 287.
See fraudulent conveyance, Rogers v. Thurston, ann.
cas. 287.
proof, the manner of proving foreign laws and judg-

cas. 287.

proof, the manner of proving foreign laws and judgments, L. A. 400.

proof of foreign laws and judgments is governed by
the lex fori, L. A. 400.

the lex fori, L. A. 400.

when the company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis,
etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.

etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.
parol evidence, sale, within contract, R. D. 471.
improvement, in ejectment for lands used for mining,
evidence of the value of surface improvements is
relevant, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 498.
See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

see malpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548. depositions, ruling as to admissibility in evidence of depositions taken in another case, Nelson v. Harring-ton, ann. cas. 548.

ton, ann. cas. 548.
the injury must be proved, see malpractice, 567.
EXECUTION.
See judgment, L. A. 225.
a treatise on the law of executions, by A. C. Freeman, review of, R. P. 564.
EXECUTORY AGREEMENT, OR BARGAIN AND SALE.
See transactions resembling sales, L. A. 136.
EXERCISE OF, BY RAILROAD COMPANY.
See eminent domain, Forney v. Fremont, etc. Co. ann. cas. 8.
EXECUTOR.
may purchase at foreclosure sale land, derived, and

may purchase at foreclosure sale land devised and mortgaged by the devisee, there being no fraud, Allen v. Gillette, ann. cas. 212. distribution, an order of distribution alone cannot discharge an executor until the estate is distributed, Cranson v. Wilsey, ann. cas. 240. conversion, where executors after an order of distribution of a fund converted to their own use, they are liable for it on their official bond, Cranson v. Wilsey, ann. cas. 240. See will, R. D. 392. powers, distinction between the powers conferred on

See will, R. D. 392.
powers, distinction between the powers conferred on
executors which imply a personal trust and those
which do not, the former can be executed only by
the executor named, the latter by his successor, R.

EXECUTOR AND ADMINISTRATOR.

purchase by, of property sold under toreclosure proceedings, trust, Allen v. Gillette, ann. cas. 212.

EXEMPTION BY CHARTER. See banks and banking, R. D. 396, EXPLANATION OF SUSPICIOUS POSSESSION. See larceny, Moreno v. State, ann. cas. II. EXPRESS TRUST.

EXPRESS TRUST:
See trust, R. D. 230.
EXPRESSION OF OPINION.
See arbitration and award, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas.

832.
FACT.
questions of, for the judge, L. A. 4.
FACTOR AND BROKERS.
FACTOR AND BROKERS.
See commission merchant, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann.

cas. 380.

FAILURE TO EXECUTE DEED.
See charitable gift, Bates v. Palmetto Society, ann. cas. 143.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS.
See scope of intent, L. A. 471.
FALSE STATEMENT.
See insurance, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann.

cas. 336.

cas. 336.
an insurance company knowing the falsehood of the statements made by the insured, and afterwards receiving two assessments, walves its right to object to such falsehood. See insurance, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas. 336.
EDERAL COURTS.

FEDERAL COURTS.
federal courts have no jurisdiction over actions
against a State in its contractual capacity, but they
have jurisdiction in actions against State officers in
relation to matters in which the State as a government has no direct interest, but involve only the
rights and duties of private persons or corporations,
such as shippers of goods and common carriers, R.
D. 494.
EDERAL DECISIONS.
VOL XXIII, edited by W. G. Myer, review of, R. P. 300.
edited by W. G. Myer, vol. XXVIII, review of, R. P.
420.

420. edited by W. G. Myer, review of, R. P. 612. FEDERAL QUESTION.

writ of error. It is too late to raise a federal question for the first time upon an application in a federal court for a writ of error, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann. See jurisdiction, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann. cas. 167.

FEES.
See attorney's lien, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191.
FEME COVERT.
See estoppel, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 503.
FIOTITIOUS ADDRESS.
See contracts, Milliken v. Western Union Tel. Co. ann. cas. 507.

See contracts, Milliken v. Western Union Tel. Co. ann. cas. 577.

FINKELNBURG.

comments on Mr. Finkelnburg's report to the National Bar Association on uniformity of State statutes relating to negotiable paper, C. E. 229.

FIRE INSURANCE.

See arbitration, Viney v. Bignold, ann. cas. 49. condition in policy, watchman, water supply, Sierra, etc. Co. v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas. 451.

FIRM ASSETS.

See partnership. Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164.

See partnership, Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164. FIRM DEBTS. See partnership, R. D. 206. FLOODS.

LOODS.
water which in a flood time escapes from a river is not surface water; a railroad which obstructs the flow of such water by its embankment is liable in damages for such obstruction, Sullens v. Chicago, etc. Co., ann. cas. 432.

FLOODING.
flooding land. Where a prescriptive right to flood
lands by a mill-dam the height to which the water
may be raised is that to which the dam actually
raises it, and not that to which it would raise it if the
dam were tight, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas. 403.
FLOODING LANDS.
See water and water-courses, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas.

FORECLOSURE.
See executor and administrator, Allen v. Gillette, ann. cas. 212.
FOREIGN ASSIGNEE.
when and how can foreign involuntary assignees swe in the domestic forum, see powers of foreign involuntary assignee, L. A. 111.
powers of, effect of voluntary assignments in aid of involuntary ones, see powers of foreign involuntary assignees, L. A. 111.
powers of, as to domestic personalty, American rule, see powers of foreign involuntary assignee, L. A. 111.
powers as to possonalty.

111.
 powers as to personalty, English rule, see powers of foreign involuntary assignee, L. A. 111.
 powers as to domestic realty, see powers of foreign involuntary assignees, L. A. 111.
 FOREIGN JUDGMENTS.
 See pleading and proof, etc., L. A. 460.

POREIGN LAWS.

foreign laws, etc., must be pleaded, L. A. 400. See pleading and proof, etc., L. A. 400. FOREIGN MARRIAGES.

L. A. 182. FOREIGNERS.

civil status of comments upon the recent international meeting at Lausanuee, Switzerland, for the consider-ration, among other things, of the legal status of foreigners, see international law, C. E. 373. FOULING STREAMS.

RAUD.

statute of, the memorandum required by the statute of frauds is not valid unless it be delivered, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 18s. surety, the purchaser of a house to be removed to his premises is not bound to notify the sureties to the bond given to the seller to remove the house of the state of the title, and is guilty of no fraud in falling to give such information, Q. A. 156.

fraudulent conveyance, deed of trust, Keagy v. Trout, ann. cas. 407.

See guardian and ward, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann. cas. 476.

cas. 476.
guardian, where a guardian, soon after his ward arrives at age, makes a settlement with him, the court will scrutinized the transaction with great-care and hold the guardian responsible if the settlement discloses the slightest fraud, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann.

closes the slightest trand, McKonkey V. Cockey, ann.
cas. 476.
evidence, where a deed appears on its face to be voluntary, it may be shown by parol that it was founded
upon a valuable consideration, Featherstone v. Dagnall, ann. cas. 544.
statute of, where one makes a parol gift to his nephew
and he takes possession of the land and makes improvements, there is a sufficient part performance to
take the case out of the statute of frauds, the land
being subsequently devised to another person,
Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas. 236.
statute of, agreement relating to land, R. D. 399.
statute of, sale of goods, part payment, R. D. 446.
statute of, sale of goods, part payment, R. D. 446.
statute of, sale of goods, part payment, R. D. 446.
statute of, see mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson,
ann. cas. 498.
FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE.
evidence, declarations, Rogers v. Thurston, ann. cas.

evidence, declarations, Rogers v. Thurston, ann. cas. 287.
See fraud, Keagy v. Trout, ann. cas. 407.
consideration, parol evidence, depositions, requirements, Featherstone v. Dagnall, ann. cas. 544.
FREEMAN.
A. C., editor of American decision, R. P. 228.
editor of American State reports, R. P. 276.
editor of American State reports, R. P. 492.
author of treatise on the law of executions, R. P. 564.
FRENCH AND SPANISH GRANTS.
See Missouri compromise, R. D. 590.
FREIGHT.
nervous shock, ffright and nervous shock do not constitute a cause of action for negligence, if no bodily harm ensues to the sufferers, R. D. 134.
FRIGHT AS A CAUSE OF ACTION.
See negligence, R. D. 134.
GENERAL DIGEST.
of the United States Supreme Court, R. P. 372.
GIFT INTER VIVOS.
declaration of donor, delivery, Bennett v. Cook, ann. cas. 507.

declaration of donor, delivery, Bennett v. Cook, ann. cas. 90.

GOOD FAITH.
bona fide holder of negotiable paper must acquire his title in good faith, L. A. 161.

GOVERNMENT.
successful, liability on contracts of deposed government. See international law, R. D. 30.

GRANT OF MINERALS.
See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 498.

GIAUQUE FLORIEN. author of manuel of notaries, R. P. 252.

author of manuel of notaries, R. F. 202.

GUARANTY.

See negotiable paper, R. D. 470.

an oral guaranty of the payment of a promissory note is held by some courts to be valid; there is a conflict of decisions, however, on that subject, Q. A. 588.

GUARDIAN AND WARD.

release, fraud, burden of proof, rescissions, laches McKonkey v. Cockey, ann cas. 476.

HABEAS CORPUS.

See constitutional law, R. D. 566.

HALL, THOS. H.

author of treatise on patent estate, R. P. 52.

HIGHWAY—STREETS—MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

author of scenario on patent estate, R. P. 52.

HIGHWAY—STREETS—MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

where a highway is opened on the margin of a city, it
has jurisdiction of that part which lies within its
limits, but no control over that without the limits,
and of that part the county court has jurisdiction,
Q. A. 300.

HUSBAND AND WIFE.

HUSBAND AND WIFE.
See equity, R. D. 278.
status of wife at common law with reference to contracts, L. A. 279.
See judgment, Shryock v. Buckman, ann. cas. 481.
IMPROVEMETS NECESSARY.
See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

INCOMPETENCY OF JUDGE. See constitutional law, C. E. 53, INCORPORATION.

e charitable gift, Bates v. Palmetto Society, ann. cas. 143. INDEMNITY.

INDEMNITY.

See partnership, R. D. 206.

INDEX NUMBER.
Our index number, C. E. 580.

INDICTMENT—SURPLUSAGE—BURGLARY.
an indictment is not vititated by surplusage. One indicted for burglary may be found guilty of statutory house-breaking, Q. A. 300.

INDORSEMENT.

See negotiable paper, R. D. 470. INDUSTRIAL LIBERTY. by John M. Bonham, review of, R. P. 396. INFANCY.

See negligence, R. D. 374.

INFANT.

an infant of such tender years as not to be able to exercise discretion or be guilty of contributory negligence, is entitled to the full pretection of the law against the negligence of others, R. D. 374.

INJUNCTION.

See leases, Hodge v. Giese, ann. cas. 64.

under what circumstances an injunction will be granted to restrain foreign traders, L. A. 186.

See boycotting, R. D. 350.

See water and water courses, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas. 408.

against rival trades, L. A. 186. INJURIES TO THIRD PERSON.

See master and servant, Driscoll v. Carlin, ann cas. 38.
INNS.

boarding houses, treatise on the law of, by Samuel H. Wandell, review of, R. P. 108.

INNKEEPER.

an innkeeper has no lien on the property of a third person in the hands of his guest if he knows the ownership thereof, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 263.
INNKEEPER'S LIEN.
principal and agent, commercial traveler, instructions
to jury, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 263.
IN REM.

IN REM.

an action to foreclose a mechanic's lien is a proceeding in rem. A judgment in such an action cannot be collaterally attacked on account of the overture of the defendant, Shryock v. Buckman, ann. cas. 481.

INSANITY.

treatise on, by E. C. Spitzka, M. D., review of, R. P. 156. INSOLVENCY. See conflict of law, In re Peck, ann. cas. 188. INSTRUCTIONS.

INSTRUCTIONS.
directing yerdict. A court should direct a verdict
against the party on whom the burden of proof rests
if the evidence does not sustain his allegations, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 263.
INSTRUCTIONS TO JURY.

See innkeeper's lien, Covington v. Newberger, ann.

eas. 263. INSTRUCTION TO PRINCIPAL. See commission merchant, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann. cas. 380.

INSURANCE.

accident insurance, suicide presumption, murder, R. D. 158.

D. 108.
mortgage, mortgagee, release, R. D. 231.
construction, condition. The condition in a policy of
insurance must, in case of doubt, be construed in
favor of the insured, regard being had to the nature
of the property, De Graff v. Queen Ins. Co. ann.
construction of collections.

cus. 284. construction of policy, live stock, lightning clause, De Graff v. Queen Ins. Oo. ann. cas. 284. application, false statement, notice, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas. 336. tontine policy, equity, accounting, trust, Uhlman v. New York, etc. Co. ann. cas. 360.

NTENT.

How far intent to deceive is essential to a recovery in an action for damages growing out of false representations. See scope of intent in false representations, L. A. 471.

NTEREST.

VYEKEST.
See change in character of trust fund, Cranson v. Wilsey, ann. cas. 240.
compound interest. When executors will be charged, and when they will not be charged compound interest on funds in their hands, Oranson v. Wilsey, ann.

INTERNATIONAL LAW. contracts of deposed government, liability of success-ful government. When a successful government is responsible for the contracts of a deposed govern-

ful government, responsible for the contracts of a deposed government, R. D. 30. the civil status of foreigners, C. E. 373.

INTERTSTATE COMMERCE. the business of sending telegrams from one State into another is interstate commerce and subject to the control of congress, Leloup v. Port of Mobile, ann.

See intoxicating liquors, C. E. 498.
See intoxicating liquors, C. E. 498.
the car-load cases, discrimination, C. E. 253.
constitutional law. A State cannot enact a law imposing upon citizens of other States a tax which does not operate equally to its own citizens, R. D.

posing upon citizens of other states a tax which does not operate equally to its own citizens, R. D. 566.

See constitutional law, R. D. 566.
INTERSTATE GARNISHMENT. L. A. 424.
INTIMIDATION.
See boycotting, R. D. 350.
INTOXICATING LIQUORS.
Interstate commerce, C. E. 498.
remarks upon intoxicating liquors as a commercial commodity connected with public policy and a control of the general government as the material of interstate commerce, C. E. 498.
IRREQUARITY.
See judgment, R. D. 326.
IRRECHARBLE INJURY.
See leases, Hodge v. Gelse, ann. cas. 64.
an injury is irreparable which cannot be redressed by pecuniary damages, Hodge v. Gelse, ann. cas. 64.
JOINT ACTION.
water and water-courses. Several proprietors of submerge land may join in an action to lower the dam and obtain an injunction providing no accounting is asked, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas. 408.
JOINT PURCHASER.
one who has paid part of his share of the purchase money of land, but failing to pay the second installment, cannot recover from his partner the money he has paid, the contract having been abandoned.
See vendor and vendee, R. D. 527.
JONES, LOENARD A.
author of a treatise on the law of liens, R. P. 294 author of treatise on personal property, R. P. 444.
JUDGE.
questions of fact for the judge, L. A. 4.

questions of fact for the judge, L. A. 4. incompetency of. See constitutional law, C. E. 53. JUDGMENT. See contract, Justice y. Justice, ann. cas. 191.

form of judgment and execution under the lex fori, L.

A. 255.

personal judgment cannot be rendered against a wife at common law, when it may be rendered, and for what, under statutes of the several States, L. A. 279. collateral attack. A judgment is not subject to the collateral attack, becaues it does not appear by the record that the notice in drainage cases provided by the statute was duly given, R. D. 326.

D. 326.

D. 326.

collateral attack, husband and wife, mechanic's lien, proceeding In rem, Shryock v. Buckman, ann. cas.

481.
the physician must exercise his best judgment. See malpractice, L. A. 567.
See foreign judgments, L. A. 591.
JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT.
remarks upon judgment by default. See summary proceedings, C. E. 541.
JUDGMENTS IN FEDERAL COURTS.
See foreign judgments, L. A. 591.

JUDGMENTS IN FEDERAL COUR See foreign judgments, L. A. 591. JUGMENTS IN PERSONAM. See foreign judgments, 591. JUDGMENT IN REM. L. A. 591. JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION.

what is reasonable time in judicial administration, L.

A. 377. JUDICIAL DISCRETION.

JUDICIAL DISCRETION.

appellate courts often refuse to exercise jurisdiction in cases in which the trial court have abused their judicial discretion, C. E. 29.

remarks upon the exercise and frequent abuse of judicial discretion, C. E. 29.

JUDICIAL MIND.

discussion of the subject of "judicial mind," its importance not only to judges but to practitioners, C. E. 421.

JURISDICTION

URISDICTION.
judgments where courts have no jurisdiction. See foreign judgments, L. A. 591.
State court. A State court has jurisdiction of an action to compel a corporation or its receiver appointed by a federal court to cancel a mortgage which had been paid. The action was against the corporation, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann. cas. 167.
State and federal court, receiver, federal question, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann cas. 167.
See constitutional law, R. D. 494.

JURISDICTION—Continued See telephone case, C. E. 517. See contempt of court, R. D. 542. JURY.

JURY.

preliminary facts relating to evidence should not be submitted to the jury, L.A. 6. argument, to in oriminal cases, L. A. 82. under Minnesota insolvent laws the insolvent is not entitled to trial by jury, in re Peck, ann. cas. 188.

JURY TRIAL. See conflict of law, In re Peck, ann. cas. 188. JUSTIFICATION. See libel, C. E. 109. LACHES.

See guardian and ward, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann. cas. 476, LARCENY.

Cas. \$40.

ARCENY.

recent possession of stolen goods, explanation of suspicious possession, Moreno v. State, ann. cas. 11.

in order to raise a presumption of gullt from the possession of stolen goods, such possession must be recent, absolute, exclusive and unexplained, Moreno v. State, ann. cas. 11.

the mere presence of stolen goods on the premises of a prisoner will not warrant a conviction if he has had an opportunity to explain how they came there, Mereno v. State, ann. cas. 11.

LEADING ARTICLES.
See legal journals, C. E. 469.

reflection upon the value and importance of leading articles in legal journals, C. E. 469.

EADING QUESTIONS.

the judge must decide whether or not leading questions may be put to a witness, and what are such questions, L. A. 8.

EASES. the registry act (N. J.) does not apply to leases. The first in time is first in right, Hodge v. Giese, ann. cas. 64. registration, irreparable injury, injunction, manda-

cas. 64.
registration, irreparable injury, injunction, mandaregistration, Hodge v. Giese, ann. eas. 64.
LEGAL JOURNALS.
leading articles, C. E. 469.
LEGAL REPORTING.

arguments of counsel, dissenting opinions, C. E. 183. LEGISLATIVE POWER. See election and voters, R. D. LETTING CONTRACT.

See municipal corporation, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann. cas. 114. LEX FORI.

the general rule of the doctrine of lex fori, L. A. 255. LIBEL.

JBEL.
publication, corporation, R. D. 3,
publication. A mere printing of libelous matter for
the use of a corporation does not constitute a publication thereof, R. D. 3,
justification, truth of charge, mitigation of damages.
Can defendant who has falled in a plea of justification prove the bad character of the plaintiff in mitigation of damages, C. E. 169,
a license tax on the occupation of doing a business is
a tax on the business, Leloup v. Port of Mobile, ann.
cas. 119.

a tax on the business, Leioup v. Fort of modile, ann. cas. 119.

LIEN.
a treatise on the law of lien, by Leonard A. Jones, review of, R. P. 204.
See innkeeper, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 263.
LIGHTNING CLAUSE.
See insurance, DeGraff v. Queen Ins. Co. ann cas. 284.
LIMITATIONS.
statute of. An action for personal injuries is barred.

JMITATIONS.

statute of. An action for personal injuries is barred by the statute of limitations, at the end of the period after the injury is suffered, which is prescribed by the statute for bringing such actions, Q. A. 52. statute of, under the doctrine of lex fori, L. A. 255. JMITATION OF ACTIONS.

See what constitutes adverse possession, Riggs v. Riley and cas 87.

See what constitutes adverse possession, Riggs v. Riley, ann. cas. 87.
statute, trover and conversion, ballment, R. D. 423.
LINDEL ESTATE.
ruling of the supreme court of the United States holding the validity of the title of heirs who derived their title through other parties from the grovernments of France and Spain. See Missouri land title, R. D.

ruling on the subject of ils pendens in actions to quiet title. What parties are affected by such action, and as to what claims it is res inter allos acta. See deed, R. D. 304. LIVE STOCK.

See insurance, DeGraff v. Queen Ins. Co. ann. cas. 284.

LOCALITY.
of practitioner. See malpractice, L. A. 567.

LOSS OF DEVISE.
See specific performance, Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas LYNCH LAW.

comments upon the violators of law practiced under

LYNCH LAW—Continued.
the name of lynch law. See Birmingham horror,
G. E. 589.
MALICE,

See slander, R. D. 54. See assault and battery, R. D. 303. MALPRACTICE.

ALPRACTICE.

pleading, action. Where a contract is made between
physician and patient for the treatment of a particular disease if the gravaman of the charge made by
the patient is negligence and unskillfulness, the action is in tort and not on contract, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 546.

pleading, nature of action, school of medicine defined,
clair verson physicians contributory negligence, av.

clairvoyant physicians, contributory negligence, evidence, depositions taken in another case, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.

L. A. 567. MANDAMUS.

ANDAMUS.

equity. A court of equity will not compel the performance by county commissioners of a purely statutory duty, such heir the issuance of such stock in fulfillment of a subscription. The remedy, if any, is by mandamus, R, D. 2.

See equity, R. D. 2.

See religious societies, R. D. 125.

a pastor is not entitled to a mandamus to obtain his office if no temporal interest are involved, State v. Bibb St. Church, ann cas. 216.

See religious society, State v. Bibb St. Church, ann. cas. 216.

cas. 216.

See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc.
Co. ann. cas. 454.
bridges. Where a mandamus is pending to require a
railroad company to bridge its track it is no objection that the contiguous track of another company
must also be bridged, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis
etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.
MANDATE.
mandate or mandamus is not the proper process to

MANDATE.

mandate or mandamus is not the proper process to compel a church to admit into its pulpit the ministers of other denominations, although it has publicly agreed to do so, R. D. 135.

MANDATORY INJUNCTION.
See leases, Hodge v. Giese, ann. cas. 64.

MANUEL OF LAW OF WILLS.

by Charles Fisk Beach, review of, R. P. 588.

MANUEL FOR NOTARIES.

by Florien Glianque, review of, R. P. 259.

MANUEL FOR NOTARIES.
by Florien Glauque, review of, R. P. 252.
MARRIAGE.
What constitutes the capacity to contract marriage.
See foreign marriages, L. A. 182.
theories respecting. See foreign marriages, L. A. 183.
governed by the lex loci. See foreign marriage, L. A. 182.

182.
in foreign State to avoid domiciliary law. See foreign marriages, L. A. 182.
of person divorced for adultery. See foreign marriages, L. A. 182.
polygamy. See foreign marriages, L. A. 182.
MARRIED WOMAN.
conveyance. A married woman can only convey land by authority and according to terms of a statute, Q. A. 168.

by authority and according to terms of a statute, Q. A. 108.

sole traders, separate, estate, strictures on modern legislation modifying the rights of married women. There is too much legislation and too much obscurity in such legislation, C. E. 181.

equitable estoppel, under circumstances stated in the opinion the claim of a married woman may be barred by an equitable estoppel, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 503.

IASTER AND SERVANT.

injuries to third persons, Driscoll v. Carlin, ann. cas. 58.

38.
a master is responsible for the negligence of his servant in leaving for several days lumber in the street, whereby a party was injured by failing over that lumber, Driscoll v. Carlin, ann. cas. 38.
a merchant is not responsible for the traveler to pay such bills when contracted, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 363.
MATURITY.
of negotiable paper. Bona fide holder must acquire his title to negotiable paper before its maturity, L. A. 160.

MEASURE OF DAMAGE.

See water and water courses, Sullen v. Chicago, etc. Co. ann. cas. 432. MECHANIC'S LIEN.

MECHANIO'S LIEN.
See judgment, Shryock v. Buckman, ann. cas. 481.
MEDICINE.
school of. What constitutes a school of medicine as that term is used in an action at law, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
school of. See majpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
MERRILL, SAMUEL S.
author of "newspaper libel," Handbook, etc., R. P. 179.
MILLER, CHALES R.
author of treatise on conditional sales, R. P. 46°.

MINES AND MINERALS.
grant of minerals, right to take out same, improvements necessary, occupation of surface, ejectment, evidence, mining custom, supply store contract for purchase of land, frauds, statute of, its application, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 498.
MINING CUSTOM.

e mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

MINNESOTA.

construction of Minnesota laws relating to insolv-ency, In re Peck, ann. cas. 188. MISAPPROPRIATION.

MISAPPROPRIATION.
See change in character of trust fund, Cranson v.
Wilsey, ann. cas. 240,
MEYER, W. G.
editor of federal decisions, R. P. 612.
MISSISSIPPI BAR ASSOCIATION.
tax-titles, C. E. I.
MISSOURI COMPROMISE.
See Missouri land titles, R. D. 590,
MISSOURI LAND TITLES.
French and Spanish grants, Missouri compromise, schools, sixteenth section, R. D. 590.
MISTAKE.
See estonnel. Galbraith. 7.

See estoppel, Galbraith v. Lunsford, ann. cas. 503. MODESTY.

a modest lawyer, corr. 276. MONOPOLY.

ONOPOLY. See trust, C. E. 205. when a trust is to be regarded as a monopoly, C. E. 205. MORMONS

ction and voters, R. D. 422.

ORTGAGE.

See executor, Allen v. Gillette, ann. cas. 212.

release, a mortgagor has no right to release a claim for a policy of insurance upon the mortgaged property affected by him in favor of the mortgaged protein the detriment of the mortgagee's interest, R. D. 231.

See insurance, R. D. 231.

See municipal corporation, Garvin v. Dausmann, ann. cas. 312.

cas. 312.

cas. 312.

a mortgage executed by the cestul que trust, if not in accordance with the purposes of the trust is invalid in Michigan, Weaver v. Van Akin, ann. cas. 367.

MORTGAGEE.

See insurance, R. D. 231.
a mortgagee in possession of chattel property before condition broken and without express agreement, L. A. 543.

in possession, his rights, duties and liabilities, L. A. 543.

in possession, his rights, duties and liabilities, L. A. 548.

MORTGAGES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY. treatise on, by Leonard Jones, review of, R. P. 444.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE FULLER. notice of his appointment, C. E. 81.

MR. FINKELNBURG'S REPORT.

See uniformity of statute law, C. E. 229.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS.

a city council having rejected all bids for a contract may reconsider and accept the offer of the lowest bidder, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann. cas. 114.

letting contract, accepting and rejecting bids, abutting lot owners, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann. cas. 114.

bonds, authority to issue, if a city issues bonds which are not authorized by law or its charter, such bonds are not valid, but under certain circumstances the city will be estopped from denying their validity in the land of a bona fide purchaser, Q. A. 156. street improvements, assessment, due process of law, notice, mortgage, Garvin v. Dausmann, ann. cas. 312.

rights of cities to grant permission to erect roles.

812. rights of cities to grant permission to erect poles and lay telegraph wires, L. A. 447. See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454. street improvements, negligence of contractor, respondeat superior, contributory negligence, what is notice, City of Birmingham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598. MUNICIPALITIES.

action against, rule as to the name of a municipality in a summons against such a body, see summons, L. A 524. MURDER.

See insurance, R. D. 158.
MEYER.
W. G., editor of federal decisions, R. P. 300.
editor of federal decisions, R. P. 420.

NAME.
fictitious name. To authorize the issuance of a summons against a party by a fictitious name it must appear that the plaintiff was ignorant of the true name of the defendant. See summons, L. A. 5:3.

NATIONAL BANKS.
See banks and banking, R. D. 398.

NATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION.
American bar association, C. E. 445.

NATURALIZATION LAWS.
Chinese comments on a ruling that a person who is

Chinese comments on a ruling that a person who is

NATURALIZATION LAWS—Continued.
neither white nor of African decent is entitled to the
benefit of our naturalization law, C. E. 325.
NEBRASKA CITATIONS.
by G. R. Chaney, review of, R. P. 180.
NECESSARIES.
statutory liability of wife for, L. A. 279.
NECESSITY OF NOTICE.
See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495.
NEGLIGENCE.
"fright as a cause of action" nervous shocks, R. D.
134.
contributory negligance inference, P. N. 274.

"fright as a cause of action" nervous shocks, R. D. 134.
See carrier, R. D. 518.
NEGLIGENCE CONTRIBUTORY.
See malpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
contributory negligence, the father of a patient cannot be charged with contributory negligence because he employed the physician knowing him to be a clairyoyant, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
contributory negligence. See malpractice, I. A. 567.
dangerous work, respondent superior. When a city lets a work on contract, and the work is intrinsically dangerous, the city is liable for injuries caused by the negligence of the contractor. The principle of the respondent superior applies in such a case, Birmingham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598.
of contractor. See municipal corporations, Birmingham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598.
NEGOTIABLE PAPER.
a person to be a bons fide holder must be the holder of negotiable paper, I. A. 160.
See uniformity of statute law, C. E. 229.
a third person indorsing a note becomes liable for its payment not as a grantor but as indorser entitled to demand and protest of the instrument, R. D. 470. indorsement, third person, guaranty, R. D. 470.
NERVOUS SHOCKS.
See negligence, R. D. 134.
NEW PARTIES.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.

See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454. NEWSPAPER LIBEL. hand book, etc., by Samuel Merrill, review of, R. P.

NON-USER WITH INTENT TO ABANDON. See easement, Snell v. Levitt, ann. cas. 552. NOTICE.

OTICE.
See assessment, R. D. 110.
construction. Effect of constructive notice of irregularity or defense to the holder of negotiable paper derived from the investment itself, L. A. 161.
bona fide holder must acquire his title to negotiable paper without previous notice of irregularity or defense, L. A. 161.

fense, L. A. 161.
n assessment by a corporation is not contrary to that
constitutional provision which forbids the deprivation of any one of property without due process of
law. This is true although the ordinance does not
provide for notice to the party. But the assessment
cannot be enforced except in courts empowered to
foreclose mortgages, Garvin v. Dausman, ann. cas. 312.

when information given to the clerk of an insurance company operates as notice to the company. See insurance, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas.

See insurance, Fitzgerald v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas.

336.
sufficiency, indefiniteness. See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495.
defect, walver. See perpetuating testimony, L. A.

must be reasonable. See perpetuating testimony, L.

A. 495. what it should contain. See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495,

L. A. 495.
See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 485.
rule as to notice to appear. See summons, L. A. 524.
rule as to notice in a summons of the nature of the
actions and the relief to be demanded. See summons, L. A. 525.
it is not necessary that a city should have special
notice of the dangerous character of the work done
by its contractors. It is charged with notice of such
danger from the time the work is commenced, Birminghan v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598.
what is notice. See municipal corporation, Birmingham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598.

ham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598

NUISANCE.

are telegraph poles and wires nuisances in fact, L. A. OBSTRUCTION.

ee water and water-courses, Sullens v. Chicago, etc. Co. ann. cas. 432.

OCCUPATION OF SURFACE. mining, it is a question for the jury how far a service may be occupied by the lessee of mines in the prose-cution of his business, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

OCCUPATION OF SURFACE.
See mines and minerals, William v. Gibson, ann. cas.
498.
OFFICERS.

of corporations. See corporation, C. E. 565.

OPTION.

removal of building. A railroad company taking land by eminent domain for right of way may give the owner the option of receiving full damages or partial damages and the right to remove the building, Forney v. Fremont, etc. Co. ann. cas. 8. See contract. Wilcox v. Cline, ann. cas. 574.

OUR NEW VOLUME, C. E. 1.

PAROL EVIDENCE.

See evidence, R. D. 471.

See fraudulent conveyance, Featherstone v. Dagnall, ann cas. 544.

PARTIES.

See corporation, Vanderwerken v. Glenn, ann cas. 386.

See corporation, Vanderwerken v. Glenn, ann cas. 886. See water and water courses, Turner v. Hart, ann.

PARTIES. the names of parties to the action must be fully set out on the face of a summons. See summons, L. A.

PARTITION.
infant, where partition of land owned by three parties one of whom was an infant was made between the other two he is not bound by the decree nor barred by the statute of limitations but may pursue his remedy in a court of equity, Q. A. 872.

PARTNERSHIP.
individual debt. A consent of all the members of a partnership is necessary to the payment, out of firm assets, of the individual debts of a partner, Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164.
firm assets, debt of individual member, declarations and admissions, estoppel, Williams v. Lewis, ann. cas. 164.
"a trust," if not duly incorporated is a partnership, C. E. 205. PARTITION

contract, firm debts, limit of liability, indemnity, R. D. 206.

D. 200.

corporations entering into a so-called trust form a partnership. If they are not authorized to do so the partnership is iliegal and either party may withdraw at pleasure, C. E. 277. PARTNERS

service of notice on. See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495.

A. 495.
rule as to inserting the names of partners in a summons. See summons, L. A. 523.
PART PAYMENT.

ART PAYMENT.
where the buyer of coru in pursuance of the contract
furnishes sacks in which said corn is to be placed
the delivery of the sacks is a part payment of the
purchase money and takes the oral contract out of
the statute of frauds, R. D. 446.
See frauds, R. D. 446.
See specific performance, Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas.
236.

PART PERFORMANCE. See fraud, Peek v. Peek, ann. cas. 479. PASTOR.

See religious societies, State v. Bibb. St. Church, ann. as. 216.

cas. 216.
PATENT ESTATE.
treaties on, by Thos. B. Hall, review of, B. P. 52.
PATENT LAW.
See telephone case, C. E. 517.
PAYMENT OR PURCHASE OF NOTE.
See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.
PENDENTE LITE.
See transaction P. D. 954

See ejectment, R. D. 254.

See ejectment, R. D. 22s.

PERPETUATING TESTIMONY.
notice and publication, L. A. 495.

PERSONAL INJURIES.
limitation, a city is liable for injuries caused by obstructions permitted in its streets and more clearly liable if the obstruction is of long standing. The statute of limitations runs from the state of the injury, Q. A. 52.

PHYSICIAN.

See contract in restraint of trade. French v. Parker.

HISCIAN.
See contract in restraint of trade, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.
when and to whom their liability attaches. See malpractice, L. A. 667.

PLACE OF TRIAL.
the place of trial must appear upon the face of the summons. See summons, L. A. 521.
PLEADING.

PLEADING.
See judgments, R. D. 326.
See malpractice, Nelson v. Harrington, ann. cas. 548.
PLEADINGS AND PROOF OF FOREIGN LAWS AND
JUDGMENTS, L. A. 400.

POLICE COURT.
jurisdiction, a city has no power beyond that conferred upon it by charter. The police court of St.
Louis has no jurisdiction of larceny, it may deny trial by jury for offenses cognizable by it, Q. A. 236.

POLICY.

description. The insurance of live stock kept in a specified barn covers a loss on the same stock when in another barn. The statement about the barn is not a condition of the policy but matter of description, DeGraff v, Queen Ins. Co. ann. cas. 284.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS. rule as to the post-office addresses of the plaintiff's attorney which must appear in the summons. See summons, L. A. 527.

POWER.

where by a will.

where by a will a widow is entitled to 'dispose of' personal property in which she has only a life estate, and take a note therefor the note belongs to POWER.

OWER.
See will, R. D. 182.
See will, R. D. 302.
See abutting proprietors, C. E. 349.
powers and regulation of railroads. See railroad, L. A. 351.

A. 331.
Ilmitation, one who deals with an agent must, at his peril, ascertain the limits of his authority. See principal and agent, Milne v. Kieb, ann. cas. 383.
POWERS OF FOREIGN INVOLUNTARY ASSIGNEES, L. A. 111.
POWER TO SELL LAND.
a principal may authorize his agent by parol to sell land in his own name and enter into a written contract for that purpose. See principal and agent, Milne v. Kieb, ann. cas. 383.
RACTICE.
See contracts in restraint of trade. French v. Parkey.

See contracts in restraint of trade, French v. Parker,

ann. cas. 527. PRACTITIONER.

of school. See malpractice, L. A. 567. PRELIMINARY QUESTION.

if deciding a preliminary question decides the main issue, the judge must not, generally, decide it, L. A.

PRESCRIPTIVE RIGHT.
See water and water-courses, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas.

See water and water-courses, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas.
403.
PRESUMPTION.
See deed, R. D. 394.
the award of arbitrators is presumed to be fair. An award which fixes the amount to be paid at less than was formerly agreed upon is not necessarily unfair, and will not be set aside. See arbitration and award, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas. 332.
PRINCIPAL AND AGENT.
See innkeeper's lien, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 232.

cas. 263.
a commercial agent must obey orders. Where goods were ordered to be sold, but before sale, and within a reasonable time after the order was given, they were burned, the agent's delay was not the proximate cause of the loss, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann.

See commission merchant, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann.

authority of agent, statute of frauds, special agent, purchaser, Milne v. Kleb, ann. cas. 383. PRIORITY. See attorney's lien, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191. privileges and priorities of foreign judgments, L. A.

PRIVILEGE.

whether evidence shall be excluded because it is a privilege communication is a question for the judge,

L. A. 7. PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS

PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS.

a party applied to state the financial standing of another, is privileged to express his opinion on that subject freely, and if he does so without malice, is not liable in an action for stander, R. D. 54.

See slander, R. D. 54.

PROCEEDING S ROR RECEIVER.

See conflict of law, in re Peck, ann. cas. 188.

PROCEDING IN REM.

See judgment, Shryock v. Buckman, ann. cas. 481.

PROMISES.

See confession, L. A. 8.

PROOF.

preliminary proof, of dying declarations, L. A. 32.

PROVISO SUING BEFORE ARBITRATION.

See arbitration, Viney v. Bignold, ann. cas. 40.

PROFESSION.

advanced state of. See malpractice, L. A. 567.

advanced state of. See malpractice, L. A. 567.
PROMISE TO PAY ANOTHER'S DEBT.
See statute of frauds, Stewart v. Jerome, ann. cas. 428.
PROXIMATE.

PROXIMATE.

See telegraph companies, R. D. 255.

PROXIMATE CAUSE.

the tort of a telegraph operator in transmitting a forged telegram which caused the shipment of money by express, and enabled him, as express agent, to embezzle it, is held the proximate cause of the loss, R. D. 226.

See commission merchant, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann. cas. 890.

PUBLICATION.
See libel, R. D. 3.
notice by publication. See perpetuating testimony,
L. A. 495.
PURCHASER.

PURCHASER.
See principal and agent, Milne v. Kleb, ann. cas. 383.
QUALIFICATION OF VOTERS,
See election and voters, R. D. 422.
QUESTION OF FACT.
when reasonable time is a question of fact, L. A. 380.
L. A., by S. D. Thompson, 4.
QUIETING TITLE.
See deed, R. D. 304.
RAILROADS.
limitations of these powers to take and and account.

See deed, R. D. 394.

RAILROADS.

limitations of these powers to take private property by right of eminent domain, Forney v. Tremont, etc. Co. ann. cas. 8.

change of track; the power of a court to order a change of a long established railroad track should not be exercised except when absolutely necessary. Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.

RAILROAD COMPANY.

See equity, R. D. 2, right of one railway company to condemn the property of another railway company under a general statutory power, L. A. 207, 231.

when, and under what circumstances, a railroad company has a right by eminent domain to condemn the property of another railroad company under a general law, L. A. 207.

street crossing, bridges, mandamus, consolidation of action, amen liment, new parties, restoration of streets, charter, construction, municipal corporation, evidence, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 554.

RAILROAD LAW.

some novel decisions, L. A. 351.

RATE.

RATE. See change in character of trust fund, Cranson v. Wilsey, ann. cas. 240. REASONABLE TIME.

EASONABLE TIME.
early conception of reasonable time as a question of law, L. A. 376.
laches, after an early settlement between guardian and ward, the latter will be allowed a reasonable time to look into the matter. Two years is held not to be an unreasonable time, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann. cas. 476. RECEIVER.

RECEIVER.
federal court, jurisdiction, a federal court upon application of its receiver, may remove a case in a State court against the corporation which was under its jurisdiction, and of which it had appointed a receiver, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann. cas. 167.
See jurisdiction, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann. cas. 167.
RECENT POSSESSION OF STOLEN GOODS.

See larceny, Moreno v. State, ann. cas. 11 RESCISSION.

what is reasonable for rescinding a contract, L. A. 379. BECONSIDERATION. the power to reconsider is inherent in every legislative body, Ross v. Stackhouse, ann. cas. 114.

RECORD.
the record of a case duly certified imports absolute verity, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191. impeaching record of foreign indgments, L. A. 591. See attorney's lien, Justice v. Justice, ann. cas. 191. See appeal, Covington v. Newberger, ann. cas. 263. See casement, Suell v. Levitt, ann. cas. 552. REFERENCE TO OMISSION TO TESTIFY ON FORMER TRIALS.

See argument to juries in criminal cases, L. A. 87. REGISTRATION. See leases, Hodge v. Giese, ann. cas. 64.

RELEASE.

ELEASE.
guardian, burden of proof. Where a guardian makes
an early settlement with his ward, and obtains a release, the burden of proof is upon him to show the
entire fairness of the settlement. The presumption
is against him, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann. cas. 476.
See guardian and ward, McKonkey v. Cockey, ann.

cas. 476. RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

ELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.
contract, enforcement, mandamus, R. D. 185.
pastor, acceptance, mandamus, State v. Bibb St.
Church, ann. cas. 316.
one who claims a right or office in a religious society
cannot have a mandamus to obtain it until his demand shall have been adjudicata by the proper
ecclesiastical tribunal, State v. Bibb St. Church, ann.

cas. 216.
voters, a State cannot constitutionally prescribe as a qualification of voters, an oath, relating to the religious belief of the voters, R. D. 422.

REMARKS OF COUNSEL.
must be objected to, if at all, in the trial court. See argument to juries in criminal cases, L. A. 87.

REMEDY.

the rule as to the remedy under the doctrine of lex fori, L. A. 255.

REMOTE CAUSE. See commission merchant, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann.

cas, 390,

REPRESENTATIVES.

rule as to inserting the name and description in a summons of persons acting in a representative capacity. See summons, L. A. 524.

RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR.

See analogal corporations, Birmingham v. McCrary,

see municipal corporations, Birmingham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 598.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE. where a physician agrees, upon selling his practice, not to pursue his profession in a certain town, the engagement is valid, and is broken if, after his removal, he revisits the town and practices medicine therein, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.

RESTRICTION.

restriction of foreign indements. L. A. 591.

therein, French v. Farker, ann. cas. 527.
RESTRICTION.
restriction of foreign judgments, L. A. 591.
REWARDS.
for detection of crime, Whitechapel "horror," C. E. 897
discussion of the subjects of rewards offered by public authority for the detection of crime and the arrest of criminals, C. E. 397.
RIGHT OF CROSS. EXAMINATION. L. A. 305.
RIGHT TO ERECT POLES AND STRING OR LAY
WIRES CONSIDERED GENERALLY, L. A. 447.
RIGHT OF MINING.
the right of mining implies the right to occupy the surface and penetrate the interior, taking from it the desired minerals, but the superincumbent soil must be adequately supported, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 496.
RIGHT TO TAKE OUT SAME.
See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas. 498.

498.
RIVAL.
traders. See injunction, L. A. 186.
RULES OF PUBLICATION.
See puperrating testimony, L. A. 495.
ALG.

definition of. See transaction resembling sales, L. A.

transaction resembling, L. A. 136.

a simple parol authority will not authorize an agent
to sign his principal's name to a contract for the
sale of land. See principal and agent, Milne & Kleb,
ann. cas. 333.
See evidence, R. D. 471.

SALE OR GIFT.
accord, agency, eift compared with sale.

SALE OR GIFT.

accord, agency, gift compared with sale. See transactions resembling sales, L. A. 136.

**SALE OR GIVING IN PAYMENT.

See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.

**SALE OF GOODS.

See frauds, R. D. 446.

**SALE OF LIQUOR BY CLUB.

transfer of property, but not sale. See transactions resembling sales, L. A. 136.

**SALE AS SPECIES OF ASSIGNMENT.

See transaction resembling sales, L. A. 136.

See contracts in restraint of trade, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.

see contracts in restraint of trade, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.
SCHOOL.
See Missouri land titles, R. D. 590.
SCOPE OF THE INTENT IN ACTIONS FOR FALSE REPRESENTATIONS. L. A. 471.
SEIZIN. A. B. D. 526.

SEIZIN.
See deed, R. D. 279.
SEPARATE ESTATE.
sole traders, C. E. 181.
liability of wife's separate estate for her contracts under the statutes of the several States, L. A. 279.
SERVICE OF NOTICE.

See perpetuating testimony, L. A. 495. SET-OFF. See defense, L. A. 255. SIXTEENTH SECTION. See Missouri land title, R. D. 590. SKILL.

the degree of skill required of a physician. See malpractice, 567. SLANDER.

privileged communications, burden of proof, malice, R. D. 54. SOLE TRADERS.

SOLE TRADERS.
See separate estate, C. E. 181.
SPECIAL AGENT.
notice, a special agent must strictly pursue his authority. Those who deal with him are chargeable with notice.
See principal and agent, Milne v. Kleb, ann. cas. 383.
SPECIAL LEGISLATION.
comments on Oho acts legislating for local and special purposes in evasion of constitutional limitations, C. E. 81.

O. E. SPECIFIC PEFORMANCE.

equity will decree a specific performance of a contract
for the delivery of chattels where there is no adequate remedy at law, R. D. 82.

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—Continued.]
See equity, R. D. 82.
consideration, statute of frauds, part performance, election, loss of devise, Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas. 236.
See equity, R. D. 278.
SPITZKA, E. C.
author of "Insanity," R. P. 156.
STATES.
suits against. See constitutional law P. D. 494

STATES.
suits against. See constitutional law, B. D. 494.
judgments in the courts of sister States. See foreign
judgments, L. A. 591.
STATE AND FEDERAL COURT.
See jurisdiction, Calhoun v. Lanaux, ann. cas. 167.
STATUTE.

TATUTE.
uniformity of, arguments in favor of procuring as far
as possible uniformity of State statutes on the subject of negotiable paper, C. E. 229.
See frauds, R. D. 399.
See limitation of action, R. D. 423.
foreign statute, a foreign statute relative to the garnishment of wages will be enforced if there is a simliar statute in the State of the forum. See interstate
garnishment, L. A. 428.

garnishment, L. A. 428.
STATUTE OF FRAUDS.
See escrow, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 138.
See specific performance, Hunter v. Mills, ann. cas.

236.
See principal and agent, Milne v. Kieb, ann. cas. 888.
a contract by which certain parties agreed to locate lands to be purchased by another, and for their services were to receive one-fourth of the proceeds of said land when sold, is not within the statute of frauds, although it was not in writing. See frauds, R. D. 339.

See promise to pay another's debt, Stewart v. Jerome,

See promise to pay another's ucbs, stewart v. san. cas. 428.
See frauds, Peek v. Peek, ann. cas. 479.
a verbal contract for the purchase of land without payment of price or part performance, is void under the statute of frauds, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

498.
STATUTORY LIABILITY OF WIFE FOR NECESSA-RIES FOR FAMILY, L. A. 279.
STATUTORY REQUISITES OF A SUMMONS, L. A. 519.
STEINSON, FREDERICK J.
author of American statute law, R. P. 80.

See equity, 2. STOCKHOLDERS.

corporations, insolvency, where a corporation made an assignment, and the trustee assessed the stockholders, bringing the suit against the corporation alone, the individual stockholders were not necessary parties, Vanderwerken v. Glenn, ann. cas. 386. STREAMS.

TORING settled Toring the stockholders were considered to the stockholders were not necessary parties, Vanderwerken v. Glenn, ann. cas. 386. STREAMS.

fowling, action for, L. A. 35. STREETS. STREETS.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.
STREET GROSSING.
See railroad company, Minneapolis v. Minneapolis, etc. Co. ann. cas. 454.
STREET IMPROVEMENTS.
See municipal corporation, Garvin v. Dausmann, ann. cas. 312.
See municipal corporation, Birmingham v. McCrary, ann. cas. 586.

ann. cas. 598. STUDENTS' LAW DIOTIONARY. by William C. Cochran, review of, R. P. 420. SUBSCRIPTION.

See equity, 2. See corporation, Vanderwerken v. Glenn, ann. cas.

SUICIDE.

dead, shot through the heart, with a pistol lying by his side, the burden of proof is upon the plaintif to show that the death was caused by accident, R. D. 158.

presumption. See insurance, R. D. 158.

SHMMONS.

character of the writ, seal, teste, signature, amendments, L. A. 519.
the name of the court must appear in the summons

L. A. 520. SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS. judgment by default, alternative service, contempt of court, C. E. 541.

SUPPLY STORE.
See mines and minerals, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

SURFACE.

mining, evidence, evidence is not admissible in ejectment for lands on which there is a mining grant, to show how much of the surface is occupied in like cases by other parties unless such occupation has referred into a custom, Williams v. Gibson, ann. cas.

SURFACE WATER.
See water and water-courses, Sullens v. Chicago, etc.
Co. ann. cas. 432.
SWEARING THE JUDGE OFF THE BENCH.
Kentucky practice of swearing a judge off the bench,
in cases of alleged bias or incompetency, C. E. 53.

In cases of alleged bias or incompetency, C. E. 53.

TAXATION.

construction of Missouri statutes settling who are
tax-paying citizens under the dram-shop laws of
that State, Q. A. 108,
See abutting proprietors, C. E. 349.
See banks and banking, R. D. 399.
national banks are not liable to city and county taxes
when they have paid the tax prescribed by the State
of 50 cents on each \$100 of their capital. See banks
and banking, R. D. 399.
TAX-TITLES.
holders of tax-titles are said to be treated with undue
rigor by the courts of Mississippi. Our views on
that subject, C. E. 1.
remarks upon tax-titles, their general invalidity, and
the reasons therefor, C. E. 1.
TAYLOR, O'HENRY.
author of law of corporations, R. P. 132.

author of law of corporations, R. P. 132. TELEGRAM.

See contracts, Milliken v. Western Union Tel. Co. ann.

TELEGRAPHS.

ELECHAPHS.
condemnation of telegraph right of way, L. A. 448.
contract, fictitious address. One may lawfully contract with a telegraph company to deliver to him a telegram sent to a fictitious address and the company is bound to deliver such telegram if it contracts to do so, and is liable in damages for non-delivery thereof, Milliken v. Western Union Tel. Co.

TELEGRAPH COMPANIES.

employees, torts, proximate, R. D. 255. TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

ELEGRAPH CUMPANI.

a telegraph company cannot be required to pay a tax
on messages sent from one State into another.
Leloup v. Port of Mobile, ann. cas. 119.
remarks of a correspondent on our comments on the
llability of a telegraph company for the torts of its
agent, corr. 347.
See contracts, Milliken v. Western Union Tel. Co. ann.

cas. 577.
TELEGRAPH POLES AND WIRES, L. A. 447.
TELEGRAPH CASE.
patent law, equity, jurisdiction. C. E. 517.
TELEPHONE LAW.
patents, jurisdiction. Remarks upon the recent ruling of M. Justice Miller in the case of the United States v. Bell Telephone Company and the jurisdiction of the federal courts to cancel a patent issued by the United States on account of fraud in obtaining such patents. C. E. 517.
TENDER.
of amount due on mortgage.

of amount due on mortgage, common law doctrine,

L. A. 55.

TENDER OF AMOUNT DUE ON MORTGAGE, L. A. 55.

where made, L. A. 56.

New York doctrine, L. A. 56.

how to be made, L. A. 57.

to whom made, L. A. 57.

when to be made, L. A. 58.

who may make, L. A. 58.

what a valid tender, must be of a sum of money, L. A. 59.

must be of precise and full amount in lawful money, L. A. 60.

L. A. 60.

Money must be produced, L. A. 61.
must be unconditional, L. A. 61.
reasonable time to accept must be given, L. A. 62.
contract for coin, contract for bank notes, L. A. 62.
effect of sufficient tender, L. A. 62.
tender after breach, L. A. 62.
tender after suit brought, L. A. 63.
tender and payment into court before decree, L. A. 63.
tender of costs, L. A. 63.
tender must be kept good, L. A. 64.

THOMPSON, S. D. author of L. A. on questions of fact for the judge, 4. THREATS.

See confession, L. A. 8.
THIRD PERSON.
See negotiable paper, R. D. 470.

TIME.

See contracts in restraint of trade, French v. Parker,

ann. cass. 527.

limitation of time does not enter into a contract by which a physician agrees not to practice in a particular town, French v. Parker, ann. cas. 527.

TONTINE.
under the tontine plans of the insurance the relation
between the insurer and the insured is that of contract, not of trust. A court of equity cannot order
an accounting under its general jurisdiction as to
trusts, Uhlman v. New York, etc. Co. ann. cas. 360.

TONTINE POLICY.
See insurance, Uhlman v. New York, etc. Co. ann. cas.

See telegraph companies, R. D. 255. TRADE.

bona fide holder must obtain his title to negotiable paper in due course of trade, L. A. 160. TRADERS.

rival. See injunction, L. A. 196.
TRANSACTIONS RESEMBLING SALES, L. A. 136.
TREATMENT.

stablished mode of. See malpractice, L. A. 567. TRESPASS

ne who holds only an equitable interest in land and has not possession of it, either actual or construct-ive, cannot maintain an action for trespasses com-

mitted upon it, L. A. 612.
TROVER AND CONVERSION.
See limitation of action, R. D. 423.
TRUST.

RUST.
where a party holds a legal title to land claimed by
another upon a parol agreement with him, the trust
in favor of such party must arise at the date of the
deed, L. A. 108.
comments on the law of trust as connected with corporation and monopoly. C. E. 208.
corporation, monopoly, C. E. 205.
See executor and administrator, Allen v. Gillette,
ann. cas. 212.
express trust, restrictions upon alienation, R. D. 230.

express trust, restrictions upon alienation, R. D. 230. See will. R. D. 302.

power of cestul que trust to incumber estate. Case stated, Weaver v. Van Akin, ann. cas. 357. See insurance, Uhlman v. New York, etc. Co. ann. cas.

deed of trust, fraud. A deed of trust is not fraudulent because the grantor may retain possession, pay interest regularly and postpone the day of payment from year to year not exceeding five years, Keagy v. Tront, ann. cas. 407.
TRUST AGAIN. C. E. 277.
TRUST FUND.
See change in character of trust fund, Cranson v. Wilsey, ann. cas. 240.
TRUSTEE PROCESS.
See interstate garnishment. L. A. 424.

See interstate garnishment, L. A. 424. TRUST.

See corporation, R. D. 590 TRUSTEES.

TRUSTEES.
See corporation, R. D. 590.
UNDELIVERED INSTRUMENT.
See escrow, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 138.
UNIFORMITY OF STATUTE LAW.
negotiable paper, Mr. Finkelnburg's report, C. E. 229.
UNITED STATES AND THE STATES UNDER THE
CONSTITUTION.

by C. S. Patterson, review of, R. P. 28. USAGE.

ustom, the judge must deside whether evidence proporting to state a usage or custom is admissible. L. A. 8. VALIDITY.

See judgment, R. D. 326. VENDOR AND VENDEE. assumpsit, R. D. 327. VERDICT.

ee water and water-courses, Sullens v. Chicago, etc. Co. ann. cas. 432.

verdict obtained by averaging the amount proposed by each juror is not illegal, provided there has been no agreement beforehand to abide by the result of the average, Sullens v. Chicago, etc. Co. ann. cas.

wades.
garnishment, employee. Ruling as to the garnishment of the wages of a non-resident employee of a foreign corporation, L. A. 428.
WAIVER OF OBJECTIONS.
See arbitration and award, Brush v. Fisher, ann. cas.

WANDELL, SAMUEL H. author of the law of inns and boarding houses, R. P.

WATCHMAN.
under a policy of insurance requiring a watchman to
be kept on the premises when the mill is idle, it is
sufficient if the watchman is in such close proximity
that he can speedily discover a fire, Sierra, etc. Co.
v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas. 451.
See fire insurance, Sierra, etc. Co. v. Hartford, etc. C.

ann. cas. 451.
WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS.
See commission merchant, Lehman v. Pritchett, ann. cas, 385.
WATER SUPPLY.
See fire insurance, Sierra, etc. Co. v. Hartford, etc. Co. ann. cas. 451.
WATERS AND WATER-COURSES.

flooding lands, measure of prescriptive right, injunc-tion, parties, Turner v. Hart, ann. cas. 403.

- WATERS AND WATER COURSES—Continued.
 obstruction, surface water, measure of damages, verdict, average, Sullens v. Ohicago, etc. Co. ann. cas.
- dict, average, sullens v. Onicago, etc. Co. ann. cas. 432.

 WHAT CONSTITUTES.
 See escrow, Wier v. Batdorf, ann. cas. 138.

 WHAT CONSTITUTES ADVERSE POSSESSION.

 Ilmitation of action, acts after title acquired, Riggs v. Riley, ann. cas. 87.

 WHITECHAPEL "HORROR."
 See rewards, C. E. 397.

 WIFE.
 artitutory liability for necessaries, L. A. 279.

- WIFE. statutory liability for necessaries, L. A. 279.
 WIFE BEATING.
 comments on the proposal to restore the whipping post for the punishment of wife beaters. Objection to the proposition because the inflictions of the punishment will degrade innocent parties, C. E. 157.
 corporal punishment, economy, C. E. 157.
- WILL.
 the intent of the testator always controls in the construction of a will, Q. A. 28.
 construction, power, R. D. 182.
 construction, trust, power, executor, R. D. 302.

- construction, trust, power, executor, R. D. 302. WITNESS.
 the judge must decide whether the inability of a witness to attend is sufficiently proved to admit his deposition, L. A. 7.
 WORK OF THE ADVOCATE.
 by B K. Elliott and W. F. Elliott, review of, R. P. 348
 WORK HOUSES.
 work-houses favored for the punishment of wife beat ers. Proceeds of their labor should inure to thei families, C. E. 157.
 WRITTEN CONTRACT.
 See evidence, R. D. 471.

INDEX

TO ALL THE ABSTRACTS IN THE "DIGEST OF RECENT CASES" IN VOLUME 27.

Explanation.—This index is prepared upon a new system, which we trust will be found convenient and satisfactory to our readers. It contains a reference under the appropriate heads to every caption in every abstract of all the weekly digests in the volume. It has no cross references, but each caption is directly referred to in the index, the number of the abstract and the page of the JOURNAL on which it appears, is appended to the caption: Thus, for example, "Compromise, 119, 175," indicates that a ruling on the subject of compromise will be found on page 175, in the abstract on that page numbered 119. Where the caption appears in more than one abstract, each abstract is referred to in like manner: Thus, Chattel Mortgage, 29, 30, 556; 35 to 38, 69; indicates that a ruling on chattel mortgages will be found in abstracts Nos. 29, 30, page 556, and also rulings on same subject in each of the abstracts on page 69, numbered from 35 to 38 inclusive. The last number in each reference indicates the page, and the number or numbers preceding it indicates the abstract or abstracts on that page to which reference is made.

Which reference is made.

Abandonment, 5, 14; 298, 95; 141, 74; 98, 150; 98, 174; 37, 268; 70, 366; 87, 416; 95, 489; 86, 468; 99, 464; 161, 490; 14, 550; 66, 557; 59, 582.

Abandonment, 1, 13; 162, 21; 1, 5, 94; 110, 200; 156, 250; 148, 273; 1, 389; 151, 365; 47, 418; 119, 410; 146, 490; 144, 513; 95, 586; 1, 579.

Abatement of Action, 124, 176; 70, 605.

Abatement and Revival, 1, 435; 121, 608.

Abduction, 72, 97; 1, 499.

Absence, 130, 344.

Absence of Counsel, 17, 244.

Absence of Judges from Court Room, 73, 97.

Absence of Judges from Court Room, 78, 97.

Absent Witness, 43, 44, 45; 31, 292; 48, 341.

Absent Witness, 43, 44, 45; 31, 292; 48, 341.

Absent Witness, 43, 44, 45; 31, 292; 48, 341.

Absent Witness, 48, 44, 45; 31, 292; 48, 341.

Absulve Deed, 198, 22; 127, 130; 138, 440.

Abstract, 5, 459; 10, 606; 6, 522; 5, 603.

Abstract of Evidence, 5, 68.

Abuss of Process, 109, 98.

Abusive Language, 44, 318.

Abutters, 68, 342; 62, 510.

Academies, 189, 563.

Acceptance, 22, 69; 23, 196; 57, 245; 28, 340; 1, 388; 53, 606.

Acceptance of Devise, 30, 107,

Acceptance of Benefit, 213, 23.

Acceptance of Devise, 30, 107,

Acceptance, 22, 69; 136; 136, 156, 153; 106, 271; 44, 292; 119, 344; 43, 380; 77, 391; 41, 46; 104, 295; 84, 367; 105, 584.

Accommodation Indorser, 28, 15.

Accommodation Expert, 148, 176.

Accommodation Paper, 148, 176.

Accommodation Super, 148, 176.

Accomblee, 51, 126; 122, 151; 168, 153; 106, 271; 44, 292; 119, 344; 43, 380; 173, 391; 41, 24; 24, 25; 2459.

Account Stated, 1, 124.

Acc

Acknowledgment of Wife, 100, 392.

Action, 3, 14; 181, 21; 289, 26; 83, 47; 128, 49; 1, 68; 139, 74; 28, 125; 40, 126; 1, 171, 126, 176; 79, 199; 42, 221; 88, 223; 1, 248; 7; 267; 20, 291; 124, 297; 171, 297; 29, 317; 65, 319; 103, 320; 1, 339; 152, 345; 1, 563; 54, 365; 68, 366; 14, 388; 102, 103, 392; 179, 385; 194, 396; 141; 22, 412; 144, 417; 3, 485; 126, 440; 130, 441; 79, 36, 463; 167, 467; 66, 496; 90, 91, 487; 159, 490; 1, 507; 96, 102, 161; 145, 513; 189, 198, 514; 173, 515; 194, 390; 197, 520; 179, 520; 179, 520; 174, 516; 1, 18, 522; 179, 529; 1, 520; 97, 906.

Action for Bond, 31, 95; 96, 200; 79, 606.

Action for Fees, 28, 35.

Action for Free, 262, 79; 171, 251; 180, 298; 81, 391; 182, 412.

Acts of Parties, 38, 16.

Acts of Sylvanta, 27, 508.

Acts of Parties, 38, 16.

Acts of Parties, 38, 16.

Acts of State Courts, 172, 132.

Actual Settler, 196, 36.

Acquisition, 130, 513.

Additional Alin ony, 45, 485.

Additional Compensation, 111, 98.

Additional Compensation, 111, 98.

Additional Compensation, 111, 98.

Additional Compensation, 117, 467.

Adequate Remedy, 39, 457.

Adequate Consideration, 177, 467.

Adequate Remedy, 39, 487.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 2, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 47, 293; 72, 457.

Administrator, 3, 68; 191, 251; 38, 293; 121, 344.

Administrator, 41, 62; 34, 59; 18, 38; 14, 485.

Adoption of Law, 166, 344.

Adoption of Law, 166, 344.

Adoption of La

```
152, 345; 3, 363; 137, 417; 91, 463; 148, 466; 4, 493; 182, 491; 175, 589; 85, 583. Agent's Commissions, 188, 467. Agreement, 142, 249; 183, 298; 127, 417; 77, 463; 156, 514. Agreement of Assignment, 147, 609. Agreement to Convey, 87, 343. Agreement Among Corporation, 152, 131. Agreement to Revive, 90 128. Agreement for use of Money, 291, 106. Aider, 164, 297. Aiding, 11, 532. Aiding, 11, 532. Aiding, 11, 532. Aiding Sheriff, 94, 367. Aiabama Claim, 105, 175. Aiabama Claim, 105, 175. Aiabama Claim, 105, 175. Ailibi, 166, 177; 24, 268. Alighting from Train, 17, 603. Allens, 117, 389; 81, 356. Aliens, 117, 389; 81, 356. Aliens, 117, 389; 81, 358. Aliens, 17, 389; 60, 148; 60, 173; 60, 246; 62, 342; 63, 359.
Allens, 117, 388; 81, 535.
Allmony, 112, 118, 98; 60, 148; 60, 173; 60, 246; 62, 342; 63, 390.
Allegation, 79, 71; 41, 147; 150, 226; 164, 370; 163, 562.
Allegation of Breach, 228, 23.
Allegation of Title, 147, 586.
Allowance, 120, 19; 123, 73; 70, 462.
Allowance of Claim, 71, 17; 95, 247; 84, 391.
Allowance of Demands, 79, 414.
Allusion, 260, 79.
Alluvium, 174, 203.
Alteration of Contract, 246, 24.
Alteration of Contract, 246, 24.
Alteration of Gauge, 169, 203.
Alteration of Instruments, 2, 146.
Alterage, 117, 48.
Alterative Service, 166, 153.
Ambiguities, 205, 420.
Ambiguities, 205, 420.
Ambiguities, 205, 420.
Amendment, 93, 17; 242, 94; 15, 44; 149, 50; 69, 71; 229, 230, 231, 75; 55, 96; 183, 102; 240, 104; 55, 148; 160, 153; 150, 177; 30, 220; 108, 248; 96, 271; 112, 272; 144, 273; 188, 275; 62, 293; 116, 295; 177, 297; 107, 344; 16, 664; 57, 366; 142, 507; 147, 148, 149, 538; 177, 297; 107, 344; 16, 664; 57, 366; 142, 507; 147, 148, 149, 538; 177, 297; 107, 344; 16, 664; 57, 366; 142, 507; 147, 148, 149, 538; 177, 539; 74, 539; 74, 539; 192, 563; 75, 583; 113, 608; 134, 609.
Amicus Burial, 86, 71.
Amount, 99, 48; 98, 271; 9, 317; 114, 115, 344; 172, 395; 179, 442.
Amount in Controversy, 9, 243; 112, 464.
     442.
Amount in Controversy, 9, 243; 112, 464.
Ancient Deed, 7t, 414.
Ancient Documents, 68, 534.
Ancient Instrument, 70, 582.
```

```
APPEAL—Continued.
91, 95, 511; 2 to 9, 582; 31, 32, 42, 583; 87, 585; 155, 588; 177, 589; 4 to 12, 585; 4 to 51, 556, 557; 178, 662; 200, 568; 2 to 13, 579, 580; 41, 42, 581; 68, 582; 114, 584; 1 to 9, 608; 32, 33, 4608; 118, 120, 608; 148, 609.

Appeal Bond, 88, 39, 252.
Appeal brom Justices, 247, 78.
Appeal brom Justices, 247, 144, 50; 152, 153, 74; 158, 75; 254, 79; 178, 101; 108, 175; 97, 247; 89, 271; 116, 521; 171, 346; 103, 104, 367; 106, 464; 103, 607.

Application of Funds, 19, 340.
Application of Purchase, 172, 328.
Appointment, 2, 68; 184, 100; 302, 107; 91, 325; 101, 367; 77, 438; 137, 455.
Appraisor, 34, 583.
Apportionment, 179, 182; 43, 45, 556; 133, 609.
Apportionment, 179, 182; 43, 45, 556; 133, 609.
Appraisor, 94, 583.
Appraisment, 163, 101; 181, 467; 13, 582.
Apprentice, 168, 418.
Appropriation, 291, 26; 297, 107; 21, 125; 166, 491.
Approv al., 261, 79; 106, 388; 169, 370; 188, 419; 172, 174, 587; 167, 610.
Aqueduct. 125, 489.
Arbitration, 29, 15; 22, 125; 158, 177; 5, 219; 156, 250; 8, 291; 36, 364; 128, 388.
Argument, 93, 463.
     582.
Argument, 95, 463.
Argument of Counsel, 257, 105.
Arraignment, 51, 148.
Arraignment, 148.
Arraignment, 148.
Arraignment, 148.
Arraignment, 148.
Arraignment, 148.
Arraignment, 148.
Arsault, 41, 45, 19, 317, 18, 349; 55, 366; 41 to 43, 418; 25, 604; 146, 609.
Assault, 41, 45, 19, 317, 18, 349; 55, 366; 41 to 48, 418; 25, 604; Assault, 418.
Assault and Battery, 38, 18, 202, 78, 77, 77, 77, 78, 418.
        149, 606.

Assault and Battery, 32, 15; 283, 78; 75, 97; 9, 291; 14, 340; 55, 390; 161, 441; 11, 12, 532; 13, 555.

Assault with Intent to Kill, 39, 7c.

Assault to Murder, 36, 604.

Assessment, 64, 16; 267, 268, 25; 126, 49; 175, 176, 51; 43, 52, 70; 272, 80; 176, 101; 221, 222, 103; 136, 130; 65, 148; 184, 154, 33, 172; 188, 184, 185, 203; 176, 227; 88, 247; 198, 202; 72, 270; 188, 275; 50; 60, 233; 177, 323; 134, 347; 145, 417; 64, 437; 174, 491; 130, 537; 178, 539; 188, 563; 58, 582; 60, 68, 606; 176, 610.

Assessor, 176, 610.
        610.
Assessor, 176. 610.
Assets, 82, 294.
Assignees, 169, 179, 21; 134, 49; 105, 172; 9, 267; 20, 340; 16, 506; 75, 535; 15, 580; 115, 584; 10, 608.
                                         signment, 31, 15: 183, 49: 146, 100: 182, 102; 23, 24, 125; 110, 129; 20, 21, 171; 73, 173; 161, 177; 20, 220; 92, 223; 118, 224; 141, 225; 25, 244; 143, 249; 177, 251; 6 to 8, 267; 51, 260; 62, 270; 86, 271; 135, 273; 10 to 19, 291; 130, 296; 192, 996; 20, 317; 4 to 14, 388; 41, 392; 76, 391; 91, 392; 103, 415, 119, 439; 15, 460; 150, 466; 160, 466; 192, 468; 71, 486; 90, 511; 140, 328; 14, 15, 555; 120, 129, 560; 147, 561; 15, 580; 94, 563; 10, 603; 154,
                         assignment for Benefit of Creditors, 21, 317; 17, 485; 15, 411; 11, 484.
Assignment for Benefit of Creditors, 21, 317; 17, 485; 16, 411; 11, 484.

Assignment for Creditors, 16, 68; 24, 94; 22, 171; 9, 10, 196; 11, 291; 22, 317; 16, 460; 12, 484; 16, 17, 508; 13, 532; 16, 17, 555; 16 17, 505; 30, 581.

Assignment of Error, 6, 14; 237, 24; 6, 7, 68; 6, 94; 4, 124; 33, 146; 12, 244; 1, 267; 3, 411; 3, 684.

Assignment of Error, 6, 14; 237, 24; 6, 7, 68; 6, 94; 4, 124; 33, 146; 12, 244; 1, 267; 3, 411; 3, 684.

Assignment of Porley, 86, 199.

Assignment of Porley, 86, 199.

Assouming Grantor's Debt, 214, 77.

Assuming Payment of Purchase Money, 146, 130.

Assumpsit, 38, 34, 15; 25, 95; 25, 26, 125; 63, 173; 149, 202; 12, 291; 15, 340; 27, 28, 584; 141, 389; 16, 412; 18, 484; 133, 440.

Assumption of Liabilities, 20, 412.

Assumption of Office, 7, 97.

Assumption of Office, 7, 97.

Assumption of Risk, 130, 465; 132, 585.

Attachment, 35, 15; 17 to 20, 44; 17 to 20, 69; 26, 27, 95; 132, 99; 25; 106; 21, 125; 25 to 25, 171; 68, 173; 11 to 13, 196; 177, 206; 92, 223; 96, 347; 144, 156, 273; 14, 15, 291; 23, 30, 317; 18, 460; 14, 484; 18 to 20, 506; 29, 510; 79, 511; 147, 518; 14, 15, 532; 18, 555; 29, 566; 96, 559; 18, 19, 580; 1, 11, 608; 234, 104.

Attack, 77, 438.

Attempt to Commit, 79, 17.

Attempt to Escape, 120, 472.

Attempting Unlawful Voting, 70, 557.

Attending Trial, 200, 492.

Attestation, 61, 46; 190, 52; 192, 492; 191, 611.

Attorney's Aggreement, 119, 275.

Attorney's Aggreement, 119, 275.

Attorney's Aggreement, 119, 275.
```

```
Attorney and Client, 71, 46; 21, 69; 28, 29, 95; 5, 146; 6, 219; 18, 244; 123, 344; 10, 388; 19, 435; 20, 555; 185, 186, 611.

Attorney's Residence, 190, 371.

Auction Sale, 71, 462.

Auditor, 12, 248, 244; 88, 391.

Authoritication, 127, 78; 72, 414.

Authority, 74, 46; 148, 168; 161, 131; 5, 146; 159, 226; 51, 365; 164, 389; 128, 518; 169, 181, 592.

Authority of Cashier, 20, 435.

Authority of Conductor, 139, 417.

Authority of Executive, 21, 129.

Authority of Executive, 21, 125.

Averaging, 121, 248.
   Authority to Contract, 122, 123.
Authority of Executive, 21, 125.
Averaging, 121, 248.
Averments, 98, 18, 241, 104; 151, 466; 130, 608.
Avulsion, 174, 395.
Award, 29, 15; 30, 95; 22, 125.
Award Paid by Foreign Government, 91, 47.
Back Taxes, 189, 298.
Bad Title, 36, 318.
Ball, 40, 45; 31, 95; 29, 125; 54, 126; 6, 7, 146; 51, 318; 19, 412; 44, 413; 19, 400; 16, 532; 46, 556.
Ball, 60, 40; 33, 41; 162, 346.
Ballee, 181, 419; 111, 336.
Ballment, 263, 25; 144, 455; 165, 467.
Balance on Account, 152, 322.
Bank Charter, 178, 491.
Banking, 16, 17, 291.
Banking, 16, 17, 291.
Banks, 36, 15; 33, 95; 30, 125; 14, 196; 58, 293; 18, 19, 340; 11, 388; 20, 412; 20 to 22, 435; 20, 460; 22, 508; 21, 555.
Banks and Banking, 26, 171; 25, 317; 12, 13, 288; 23, 435; 175, 491; 33, 556; 20, 580.
Bankruptey, 21, 22, 44; 32, 95; 180, 249; 18, 291; 20, 340; 135, 560.
491; 33, 556; 29, 580.

Bankruptey, 21, 22, 44; 32, 95; 180, 249; 18, 291; 20, 340; 135, 560.

Bar, 149, 74; 194, 76; 61, 246; 131, 369.

Bartender, 107, 438.

Base burning Steam Generator, 97, 464.

Bastardy, 37, 15; 34, 95; 157, 100; 8, 146; 118, 151; 15, 196; 7, 219; 19, 244; 29, 317; 33, 365; 21, 412; 24, 485; 17, 532.

Beneficiary, 156, 20; 88, 47; 172, 51; 26, 197; 106, 295; 123, 368; 206, 420; 101, 99, 488.

Benefit of Creditors, 20, 171; 4, 5, 388.

Benefit of Oreditors, 20, 171; 4, 5, 388.

Benefit of Oreditors, 20, 171; 4, 5, 388.

Benefit of Indian Sociation, 44, 126.

Bequest, 26, 197; 22, 533.

Betterments, 281, 90.

Bill and Answer, 101, 18.

Bill in Exceptions, 228, 24; 3, 43; 14, 44; 42, 45; 8, 66; 3252, 105; 6, 171; 156, 177; 2, 136; 5, 243; 112, 248; 55, 269; 166, 297; 3, 339; 40, 341; 4, 411; 7, 435; 6, 459; 2, 7, 532; 4, 555; 47, 556; 1, 603.

Bill of Exceptions, 228, 24; 3, 43; 14, 44; 42, 45; 8, 66; 3252, 416; 163, 491; 27, 555.

Bill of Farels, 114, 18.

Bill of Particulars, 156, 131.

Bill of Particulars, 156, 131.

Bill of Rights, 49, 96.

Bill and Notes, 38 to 42, 15; 22, 23, 69; 35, 96; 31, 125; 9, 146; 27, 171; 16, 196; 19, 291; 27, 28, 317; 35, 36, 365; 14, 15, 38; 22, 412; 162, 441; 23, 506; 18, 19, 532, 533; 21, 590; 12 to 14, 603.

Binding Firm, 149, 394; 138, 538.

Black-list, 192, 596.
            608.

Binding Firm, 149, 394; 138, 538.

Binding Firm, 149, 394; 138, 538.

Black: list, 128, 560.

Blanks, 128, 518.

Block Surveys, 161, 539.

Board of Health, 31, 340.

Boiler Inspector, 150, 296.

Bona Fide Holder, 36, 365; 191, 515.

Bona Fide Purchaser, 104, 38; 45, 269; 125, 321; 196, 347; 191, 396; 191, 419; 148, 408; 186, 587; 77, 606; 93, 607; 189, 611, 56, 196.

Bond, 8, 14, 38, 17, 108, 30, 30, 30, 407; 189, 611, 56, 196.
         396; 191, 419; 148, 468; 168, 587; 77, 606; 93, 607; 188, 611, 56, 198.

Bond, 8, 14; 28, 17; 195; 22; 23, 44; 160, 50; 169, 51; 280, 80; 34, 95; 328, 105; 5, 124; 169, 129; 179, 139; 16, 16; 31, 147; 86, 149; 202, 164; 17, 18, 19; 20, 196; 119, 249; 167, 250; 170, 191, 251; 28, 270; 20, 291; 65, 233; 29, 294; 171, 297; 29, 30, 317; 187, 324; 76, 342; 28, 89, 343; 130, 131, 344; 5, 6, 364; 153, 345; 27, 353; 134, 369; 166, 370; 16, 17, 389; 389; 85, 391; 193, 419; 25, 435; 45, 466; 117, 439; 7, 469; 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 400; 190, 467; 5, 494; 64, 486; 77, 487; 20, 24, 25, 506; 42, 509; 188, 139, 513; 173, 515; 1, 16, 52; 31, 533; 67, 535; 128, 537; 38, 22, 23, 536; 18, 580; 71, 682; 163, 535; 67, 535; 128, 537; 38, 22, 23, 536; 18, 509; 71, 582; 168, 172, 567; 2, 15, 603; 34, 604; 79, 606. Bond for Deed, 191, 298. Bond of Evidence, 91, 35, 463. Bonds to Railroads, 196, 197, 22. Bond to Recovery, 192, 204. Books of Account, 69, 46. Borough, 24, 69; 44, 70; 111, 146; 8, 219; 34, 556; 177, 610. Bottomry, 196, 50; 127, 465. Bottomry, 196, 50; 111, 200; 163, 306; 31, 32, 317; 18, 389; 54, 418; 26, 436; 65, 437; 189, 442; 22, 400; 15, 484; 3, 507; 26, 506; 20, 331; 24, 551; 27, 504, 566; 40, 556; 187, 563. Boundary, 38, 365; 169, 395; 25, 96, 555; 40, 556; 187, 563.
                        Boundary, 38, 365; 169, 395; 25, 26, 555; 40, 556; 187, 563.
                     Boycotting, 48, 16; 31, 69; 57, 126; 23, 244.
```

```
Breach, 30, 44; 189, 52; 185, 76; 104, 150; 179, 158; 89, 343; 54, 365; 184, 419; 121, 464; 193, 468; 156, 490.
Breach of Condition, 759, 30; 180, 21.
Breach of Contract, 38, 95; 192, 584.
Breach of Warranty, 38, 413.
Brewer's Licenses, 115, 398.
Brewer's Licenses, 115, 398.
Brewer's 0, 70; 33, 172; 172, 178; 21, 291; 41, 341; 76, 366; 19, 389.
Bribery, 60, 70; 39, 172; 172, 178; 21, 291; 41, 341; 76, 366; 19, 389.

Bridge, 128, 130; 13, 146; 23, 196; 127, 249; 39, 365; 20, 389; 89, 365; 25, 580; 152, 610.

Brief, 9, 14; 8, 364.

Brief of Evidence, 175, 418.

Bringing Pauper into State, 148, 50.

British Vessel, 161, 490; 123, 512.

Brokers, 24, 44; 29, 69; 37, 36; 144, 100; 33, 125; 24, 25, 196 197; 20, 244; 84, 247; 27, 436.

Building, 128, 130; 138, 176; 128, 249; 34, 581.

Building Association, 14, 146.

Building Association, 14, 146.

Building and Loan Association, 292, 106.

Bung-bushings, 136, 49.

Bung-fasteners and Covers, 110, 559.

Burden of Proof, 39, 15; 189, 204, 22; 27, 125; 122, 176; 160, 220; 59, 271; 121, 272; 198, 298; 19, 317; 149, 522; 144, 534; 25, 469; 45, 461; 89, 463; 144, 465; 197, 492; 151, 146, 561; 98, 697.
     25, 400; 45, 461; 89, 463; 144, 465; 197, 492; 151, 146, 561; 98, 607.

Burglary, 61, 70; 55, 126; 38, 147; 32, 221; 10, 267; 22, 291; 33, 317; 21, 340; 44, 380; 38, 583.

Business, 141, 74; 88, 666.

Business House, 142, 20.

Business Premises, 97, 174.

Business Sign, 78, 270.

Bustles, 151, 296.

By-laws, 98, 247.

Calls, 36, 96; 24, 555.

Calling at Ports, 169, 227.

Canal, 297, 107; 67, 437; 78, 487.

Canal, 297, 107; 67, 437; 78, 487.

Canelling, 251, 24.

Cancelling, 251, 24.

Cancelling Contract, 153, 322.

Cancelling Deeds, 287, 26; 68, 293; 72, 391; 55, 534.

Canyass, 118, 99.

Canvassing Board, 58, 462.

Capacity, 193, 228; 199, 252.

Captal Case, 107, 586.

Capsules, 115, 488,

Car Coupling, 132, 297.

Care, 26, 580.
        Capsules, 115, 498,
Car Coupling, 132, 297.
Carc, 28, 280.
Cargo Owner, 174, 467.
Cargo Cwner, 174, 467.
Carpet Sweepers, 104, 488.
Carriage, 182, 308.
Carriage, 183, 27, 505; 189, 562, 20 to 22, 580-581; 16, 17, 608.
Carriage of Passengers, 30, 31, 509; 29, 581.
Carriage of Passengers, 30, 31, 509; 29, 581.
Carriage of Passengers, 30, 31, 509; 29, 581.
Carriage Weapons, 76, 97; 40, 41, 172; 18, 608.
Carse Made, 48, 557.
Case Settled, 174, 418.
Cashier, 16, 291.
Cashier's Bond, 18, 340.
Cashier's Bond, 18, 340.
Cashier's Chiecks, 21, 436.
Causes of Action, 183, 442.
Caveat Emptor, 193, 596.
Celluloid, 116, 383; 155, 418.
Census, 29, 436.
Certainty, 35, 69; 30, 460.
Certificate, 164, 50; 10, 68; 68, 246; 162, 297; 177, 370; 161, 514; 108, 559; 5, 580.
Certificate of Evidence, 5, 411.
Certifying to Supreme Court, 569, 25.
Certiorari, 269, 25; 32, 69; 106, 129; 4, 146; 55, 245; 113, 248; 34, 318; 62, 414; 101, 415; 19, 603; 150, 609.
Cess Pool, 110, 488.
                    Cess Pool, 110, 488.
              Cestul Que Trust, 119, 224; 141, 249.
Challenges, 74, 17; 45 to 53, 318; 116, 344; 159, 346; 124, 398; 52, 557; 121, 584; 37, 604.
Challenges to Array, 124, 398.
Chambers, 138, 580.
Champerty, 17, 146; 27, 412; 20, 603.
Champerty, 17, 146; 27, 412; 20, 603.
Changer Quase, 128, 248.
Chandellers, 98, 464.
Change, 195, 275; 190, 371; 181, 396; 196, 563; 189, 587.
Change, 195, 275; 190, 371; 181, 396; 196, 563; 189, 587.
Change of Beneficiary, 89, 199.
Change of Venue, 266, 107; 56, 386; 51, 390; 38, 604.
Changing Course, 26, 230; 27, 389.
Character, 236, 78; 106, 320.
Character, 236, 78; 106, 320.
Character of Deceased, 52, 45.
Character of Prosecution, 57, 437.
Charge, 36, 128.
Charge, 36, 128.
Charge Upon Real Estate, 198, 275.
                    Cestui Que Trust, 119, 224: 141, 249.
```

```
Charitable Uses, 26, 27, 197; 22, 244; 23, 291; 195, 324; 21, 533; 28, 556.
Charities, 33, 34, 69; 22, 244; 22, 533; 178, 611.
Charity, 49, 16.
Charters, 49, 76; 23, 147; 167 to 170, 203; 168, 169, 274; 26, 533; 113, 537.
Charter Party, 179, 153; 183, 395; 185, 443.
Charter Provisions, 108, 48.
Chastity of Complainant, 17, 582.
Chattel Interest, 156, 561.
Chattel Mortgage, 25, 29, 44; 25 to 38, 69; 42, 43, 95; 77, 97; 36, 125; 16, 18, 146, 35, 42, 147; 54, 148; 30, 172; 28, 197; 12 to 14, 220; 132, 249; 24, 25, 26, 291 292; 146, 296; 101, 320; 23, 340; 40, 365; 6, 889; 22, 28, 299; 29, 439; 155, 441; 23, 460; 82, 463; 17, 484; 32 to 35, 509; 14, 582; 124, 587; 29, 30, 566; Childen, 79, 127; 146, 417; 45, 465.
Chinese, 25, 389.
Choroform, 136, 49.
Choroform, 19, 187; 146, 417; 45, 485.
Chinese, 25, 389.
Clider, 105, 439.
Clider, 105, 439.
Cliquit Court. 166, 224.
          Charitable Uses, 26, 27, 197; 22, 244; 23, 291; 195, 324; 21,
   Chose in Action, 34, 10.
Christian Scientists, 141, 389.
Clder, 105, 438.
Clder, 105, 438.
Clpher Dispatch, 183, 491.
Circuit (20urt, 106, 224.
Cltation, 311, 107.
Cltizenship, 258, 259, 25; 100, 48; 99, 271; 24, 389; 178, 442; 130, 513.
Citizenship, 258, 259, 25; 100, 48; 99, 271; 24, 389; 178, 442; 130, 513.
Citizenship Corporations, 48, 509.
Citizenship of Parties, 163, 514.
City and County Property, 273, 80.
Citizenship of Parties, 163, 514.
City and County Property, 273, 80.
City befire, 132, 151.
City Gheer, 132, 151.
City Officer, 132, 151.
City Officer, 132, 151.
City Property, 273, 25.
City Limits, 81, 487.
Civil Actions, 193, 443.
Civil Deaths, 193, 540.
Civil Service, 133, 223.
Civil Rights, 43, 881.
Civil Beaths, 193, 540.
Civil Service, 133, 223.
Civil Rights, 43, 881.
Claim Against Estate, 92, 320.
Claim Against Estate, 92, 320.
Claim Against the United States, 91, 97, 47; 106, 224.
Claiman, 79, 223; 83, 415; 18, 580.
Claim Bond, 19, 44.
Clay-bird Traps, 137, 49.
Clerk of Court, 25, 389; 35, 96, 392; 18, 484.
Clock in Vacation, 107, 464.
Closing, 108, 344.
Cloud upon Title, 189, 204; 170, 227.
Coal, 182, 395; 91, 607.
Coal Contract, 129, 489.
Code of Civil Procedure, 63, 480; 125, 489.
Code of Civil Procedure, 63, 480; 125, 489.
Code of Courtact, 129, 489.
Code of Courtact, 129, 489.
Code of Covernact, 136, 248; 188, 275; 91, 320; 122, 393; 79, 488; 120, 440; 157, 441; 113, 512; 23, 533; 94, 535; 179, 539; 188, 540; 94, 607.
Collateral Attack, 80, 47; 56, 96; 103, 98; 183, 102; 238, 106; 78, 174; 183, 293, 166, 248; 188, 275; 91, 320; 122, 393; 79, 488; 120, 440; 157, 441; 113, 512; 23, 533; 94, 535; 179, 539; 188, 540; 94, 607.
Collateral Inheritance, 62, 557.
Collateral Inheritance, 62, 557.
Collateral Subscriptions, 20, 220.
Collections, 14, 196; 128, 201; 190, 298; 187, 324; 145, 417; 177, 610.
Collection of Taxes, 280, 106; 185, 348.
Collection, 778, 51.
                     610.

Collection of Taxes, 280, 106; 185, 348.

Collection, 178, 51.

Collision, 40, 41, 70; 255, 79; 44 to 47, 96; 38, 125; 19, 146; 31, 32, 172; 24 to 26, 220; 170 to 172, 274; 24, 25, 340; 26 to 34, 365; 28, 412; 30 to 34, 496; 146, 441; 24, 460; 19 to 23, 488; 36, 509; 31, 556.

Collusive Sale, 122, 73.

Color of Title, 117, 99; 126, 296.

Coloring Matter, 135, 201.

Combinations, 69, 16.

Comity, 150, 296.

Commencement of Action, 188, 371.
                 Combinations, 69, 16.
Commencement of Action, 188, 371.
Comments on Defendant's Failure to Testify, 29, 268.
Comment on Evidence, 10, 44.
Comment on Evidence, 10, 44.
Comment on Evidence, 10, 492.
Commission, 24, 44; 178, 51; 29, 69; 37, 95; 33, 125; 24, 25, 196-197; 84, 247; 173, 442; 74, 462; 71, 535; 64, 557; 86, 556; 79, 583; 10, 663; 76, 696.
Commissioners, 192, 234; 8, 363; 37, 38, 569; 71, 510.
Commissioner's Courts, 86, 343.
Commissioner of Pensions, 130, 585.
Committee, 152, 20.
Committee, 152, 20.
Common Counts, 151, 586.
Common Nuisance, 167, 322.
Common Source, 184, 687.
Community Property, 99, 175; 79, 80, 199; 79, 270; 87, 463.
Comparative Credibility, 208, 420.
```

```
Compelling the Delivery of Papers, 122, 99.

Compensation, 201, 22; 219, 23; 113, 48; 130, 49; 21, 69; 123, 73; 226, 104; 85, 127; 67, 173; 83, 64, 246; 43, 269; 164, 274; 24, 317; 69, 342; 68, 391; 54, 462; 160, 490; 168, 491; 54, 534; 170, 562; 182, 563; 66, 605; 129, 608.

Compensation of Trustee, 197, 154.

Competency, 65, 127; 199, 204; 123, 560.

Competitive Designs, 34, 581.

Complaint, 6, 48; 17, 44; 68, 97; 94, 98; 35, 221; 165, 250; 162, 564.
Competitive Designs, 34, 881.
Complaint, 6, 43; 17, 44; 88, 97; 94, 98; 35, 221; 165, 250; 162, 514.
Complaint and Warrant, 57, 366.
Complying with Statute, 21, 230.
Composition and Warrant, 57, 366.
Complying with Statute, 21, 230.
Composition, 40, 15; 21, 44.
Composition, 40, 15; 21, 44.
Composition with Creditors, 39, 125.
Compromise, 234, 24; 119, 175; 4, 19, 435; 11, 340; 20, 555.
Compromise, 234, 24; 119, 175; 4, 19, 435; 11, 340; 20, 555.
Compromise, 234, 24; 119, 175; 4, 19, 435;
Compulsory Reference, 58, 486.
Concealment of Facts, 187, 448.
Concealment of Facts, 187, 448.
Concealment of Facts, 187, 448.
Conclusiveness, 60, 46; 184, 102; 65, 462.
Concurrence, 7, 94.
Condemnation, 178, 370.
Condition, 281, 28; 113, 73; 154, 155, 74; 174, 101; 24, 147; 107, 175; 62, 222; 93, 232; 24, 244; 98, 247; 41, 318; 66, 342; 1, 388; 112, 338; 112 to 114, 416; 183, 419; 182, 442; 26, 460; 194, 468; 193, 492; 40, 599; 57, 98, 511; 32, 566; 169, 610.
Condition Subsequent, 98, 72; 176, 132.
Conditional Law, 36, 39.
Conditional Law, 36, 39.
Conditional Law, 36, 39.
Conditional Subscription to Stock, 17, 287.
Conditional Ficket, 34, 125.
Conduct, 190, 72.
Confederate Soldiers, 81, 44.
Confession, 164, 21; 170, 75; 78, 97; 184, 102; 39, 147; 115, 175; 101, 200; 161, 177; 33, 221; 23, 268; 92, 271; 77, 391; 31, 485; 36, 533; 38, 557.
Confidential Relations, 89, 609.
Confirmation, 250, 428, 73; 110, 111, 416.
Condition of Laws, 17, 39, 123, 73; 110, 111, 416.
         101, 300; 161, 171; 35, 221; 25, 296; 92, 271; 77, 301; 31, 485; 36, 533; 33, 507.

Confidential Relations, 89, 669.

Conflict of Laws, 17, 69; 128, 73; 110, 111, 416.

Conflicting Affidavits, 107, 392.

Conflicting Evidence, 64, 46; 114, 224.

Conflicting Evidence, 64, 46; 114, 224.

Conflicting Statements, 5, 243.

Confession of Goods, 42, 70.

Congress, 108, 72.

Connecting Lines, 45, 15; 39, 39; 29, 172.

Consent, 55, 46; 97, 150; 99, 271; 173, 323; 99, 659.

Consideration, 4, 14; 40, 15; 211, 23; 119, 73; 156, 100; 166, 101; 23, 125, 96, 120; 294, 175, 294, 175, 77, 77, 77, 78, 292; 94, 222; 171, 172, 277; 21, 244; 151, 260; 6, 267; 67, 270; 184, 375; 91, 294; 36, 318; 85, 390; 26, 340; 41, 44, 365; 158, 370; 72, 301; 22, 412; 36, 83, 415; 158, 196, 419; 80, 463; 24, 484; 77, 510; 88, 511; 75, 535; 156, 561; 12, 136, 603; 146, 610; 187, 611.

Consignment, 93, 367.

Consolidation, 65, 16; 265, 105; 18, 268; 41, 350; 49, 437; 130, 447; 137, 585.

Conspiracy, 67, 136; 89, 91, 174; 23, 244; 190, 562.

Constitutionality, 110, 296.

Constitutionality, 110, 296.

Constitutionality, 110, 296.

Constitutionality, 1193, 125, 292; 179, 227; 24, 244; 199, 247; 14, 267; 28, 29, 292; 35, 318; 31 to 33; 340; 198, 347; 42, 38, 36; 29, 412; 41, 136; 109, 123, 125, 126; 179, 227; 24, 244; 99, 247; 14, 267; 28, 29, 292; 35, 318; 31 to 33; 340; 198, 347; 42, 43, 385; 19, 37, 889, 35 to 37, 436; 64, 487; 151, 160, 441; 59, 462; 29, 481; 92, 487; 91, 536; 33, 31; 506; 33, 340; 198, 347; 42, 43, 385; 19, 37, 889, 35 to 37, 436; 64, 487; 151, 160, 441; 59, 462; 29, 481; 92, 487; 91, 536; 33, 31; 506; 33, 510; 306; 33, 581; 129, 585; 21, 603; 88, 606.
              SS, 606.
Constitutional Power, 42, 461.
Construct, 25, 604.
Construction, 292 to 295, 26; 161, 50; 191, 192, 52; 45, 70; 296, 80; 247, 104; 301 to 504, 107; 31, 125; 127, 130; 139, 152; 205 to 206, 154-155; 88, 173; 194 to 196, 179; 89, 197; 59, 189; 74, 199; 198, 204; 15, 220; 45, 221; 97, 223; 194 to 197, 282; 26, 244; 193 to 197, 251; 252; 15, 267; 81, 270; 140, 273; 187, 274; 198, 199, 275; 188, 199, 289; 67 to 68, 319; 189 to 197, 341; 167, 274; 102, 343; 149, 369; 193 to 198, 371; 192 to 188, 396; 30, 412; 59, 418; 149, 369; 193 to 198, 371; 192 to 188, 396; 30, 412; 59, 418; 149, 448; 165, 57; 140 to 146, 561; 199, 563; 30, 581; 81, 583; 191 to 194, 540; 60, 557; 140 to 146, 561; 199, 563; 30, 581; 81, 583; 191 to 196, 588; 25, 604; 62, 605; 87, 606; 97, 607; 147, 600; 189 to 192, 611.
Construction Company, 30, 244.
Construction Company, 30, 244.
Construction Company, 30, 244.
Constructive Service, 95, 47.
Constructive Service, 95, 47.
Constructive Trust, 188, 228; 191, 275; 129, 344; 186, 611.
Contemporaneous Writings, 22, 606.
Contempt, 56, 16; 7, 43; 42, 126; 106, 129; 33, 197; 30, 292; 5, 383; 120, 393; 96, 467; 23, 583; 35, 566; 186, 569; 50, 562; 171, 587.
Contest, 195, 52; 107, 72; 225, 104; 199, 371; 62, 414; 197, 443; 96, 463; 194, 492.
Contest Pleading, 42, 269.
Contested Election, 68, 149; 108, 271.
                                 Constitutional Power, 42, 461.
```

County Board, 50, 126; 98, 294.

County Commissioners, 217, 23; 47, 126; 33, 147.
County Court, 107, 72; 172, 178; 118, 608.
County Judge, 30, 364.
County Judge, 30, 364.
County Judges, 30, 364.
County Decorder, 67, 414; 40, 551; 64, 605.
County Becorder, 130, 49.
County George, 67, 414; 40, 551; 64, 605.
County Recorder, 130, 49.
County Surveyor, 28, 69.
County Treasurer, 124, 465.
County And Voters, 28, 292.
Coupons, 164, 466.
Courses, 18, 389; 26, 508.
Courtes, 72, 1714, 75; 50, 96; 71, 97; 37, 125; 48, 49, 126; 29, 220; 35, 241; 163, 260; 2, 267; 21, 268; 108, 271; 43, 318; 132, 220; 35, 241; 163, 260; 2, 267; 21, 268; 108, 271; 43, 318; 132, 220; 35, 241; 163, 260; 227, 78; 34, 147; 39, 40, 197; 46, 221; 36, 245; 36, 242; 55, 283; 71, 319; 54, 365; 69, 366; 38, 39, 413; 121, 464; 29, 484; 49, 509; 106, 559; 143, 561.
Coverture, 182, 21; 127, 489; 87, 558.
Creation, 15, 460.
Credit of Winesses, 160, 250.
Creditorier, 127, 151.
Creditors, 222, 23; 76, 46; 131, 73; 100, 128; 118, 129; 92, 222; 68, 270; 136, 273; 198, 275; 10, 291; 81, 319; 115, 321; 100, 367; 15, 380; 12, 388; 89, 392; 153, 418; 39, 486; 90, 433; 90, 463; 71, 486; 85, 487; 155, 514; 75, 535; 14, 555; 99, 584.
Creditor of Beneficiary, 100, 18.
Creditor of Bill, 56, 70; 35, 147; 37, 292; 35, 341; 50, 509.
Criminal Cases, 35, 45; 51, 70; 98, 320; 52, 385; 88, 461.
Criminal Law, 73 to 81, 17; 39 to 69, 45-46; 87 to 99, 70-71-72; 72 to 56, 97-98; 171, 101; 36 to 50, 147-148; 51 to 73, 126, 127; 39 to 56, 172-173; 41 to 51, 197; 198; 30 to 40, 220-221; 37 to 54, 245; 22 to 31, 268; 38 to 51, 510; 58, 509; 510; 335; 47 to 59, 56-557; 41 to 51, 435; 45; 51 to 78, 126, 127; 39 to 56, 172-147; 41 to 61, 197; 198; 30 to 40, 220-221; 37 to 54, 245; 22 to 31, 268; 38 to 51, 608, 509; 510; 31 to 41, 533; 47 to 59, 56-557; 41 to 51, 45; 45; 51, 57, 58, 500; 510; 538; 509; 510; 31 to 41, 533; 47 to 59, 56-557; 41 to 51, 168; 32 to 52, 63, 819; 32, 390.
Criminal Libel, 130, 888; 121, 660.
Criminal Practice, 91, 72; 96, 98; 51 to 63, 148; 102, 175; 55, 245; 62, 63, 319; 32, 390.
Criminal Prac

Crimination, 214, 155.
Crop, 109, 48; 198, 102; 104, 271; 93, 343; 123, 368; 131, 417; 127, 608.
Cross-bill, 115, 73.
Cross-demands, 1, 483.
Cross-demands, 1, 483.
Cross-demands, 1, 483.
Cross-examination, 216 155; 30, 268; 46, 318; 209, 420.
Crossing, 255, 79; 168, 131; 168, 250; 168, 323; 33, 389; 69, 391; 106, 539; 169, 587.
Crossing Track, 205, 22:
Cruelty, 229, 23; 79, 127; 64, 148; 37, 268; 62, 437; 47, 49, 534.
Cruelty to Animals, 54, 16; 138, 296.
Cultivators, 118, 353; 150 to 153, 394; 156, 418.
Culverts, 142, 513.
Cumulative Sentences, 41, 292.
Curtesy, 97 to 105, 98; 112, 200; 97, 294; 194, 540.
Custody of Children, 71, 366; 57, 605.
Custody of Children, 71, 366; 57, 605.
Custody of Returns, 108, 72.
Custom, 187, 22; 181, 182; 58, 148; 46, 365; 58, 390; 145, 394.
Custom Duties, 82 to 94, 17; 92, 72; 98, 98; 74, 127; 54, 390.
Custom Officer, 14, 460.
Cutting Timber, 192, 563.
Cy Pres, 33, 68.
Damages, 85, 17; 104, 18; 138, 19; 90, 47; 18, 69; 93 to 95, 72; 270 to 283, 80; 38, 95; 44, 96; 68, 97; 99, 98; 75, 127; 143, 130; 54, 148; 171 to 176, 153; 24, 171; 29, 172; 57, 173; 23, 196; 34, 197; 108, 200; 150, 302; 12 to 24, 220; 41, 221; 127 to 134, 249; 144, 250; 32, 288; 85; 270; 87, 271; 173, 271; 28 66, 298; 119, 296; 23, 387; 64 to 78, 319; 196, 324; 2, 339; 61, 442; 94, 343; 170, 346; 75 to 78, 366; 130, 368; 168, 570; 38, 389; 35 to 61, 124, 489; 50, 461; 60, 462; 175, 467; 14, 482; 51, 470; 156, 490; 144, 250; 32, 288; 85; 570; 87, 271; 173, 271; 25, 266; 89, 581; 112, 586; 506; 124, 599; 155, 561; 132, 563; 29, 681; 191, 563; 109, 564; 158, 565; 118, 565; 176, 605; 184, 610.
Damages for Intringement, 152, 384.
Damages for Mental Suffering, 99, 175.
Damnum Absque Injuria, 183, 227.
Damager, 141, 296.
Danagerous Approaches, 30, 500.
Danagerous Ap

369.
Dates, 60, 46.
Dealings, 152, 418.
Death, 156, 20; 207, 23; 96, 72; 183, 74; 5, 94; 42, 221; 29, 440; 81, 511; 52, 562.
Death of Assignor, 22, 171.
Death of Child, 94, 72.
Death of Grantor, 131, 19.
Death after Judgment, 1, 13.

```
Death of Parties, 202, 102.
Death by Wrongful Act, 85, 17; 3, 94; 55, 148.
Debts, 267, 25; 76, 199; 74, 222; 175, 251; 51, 461; 105, 559; 95,
Defendant's State of Minu, 50, 71.
Defense, 180, 153; 49, 198; 190, 524; 82, 391; 27, 412; 98, 415, 152, 669.
Defense of Property, 45, 341.
Degree of Care, 115, 48.
Delay, 30, 69; 136, 99; 183, 251; 11, 267; 168 to 174, 274; 145, 322; 178, 395; 79, 414; 16, 603.
Delay in Glwing Security for Interest, 117, 272.
Delay in Judgment, 1, 13.
Delay in Signaling, 31, 436.
Delay in Trial, 38, 221.
Delaying of Possession, 121, 73.
Delegating, 128, 103.
Delegating, 218, 103.
Delegating, 218, 103.
Delegation of Authority, 132, 130.
Delinquenty, 181, 467.
Delinquenty, 181, 467.
Delinquenty, 187, 467.
Delinquents, 179, 51; 6, 219.
Delivery, 87, 88, 17; 68, 46; 99, 100, 72; 177, 132; 56, 148; 52, 198; 57, 245; 172, 251; 198, 252; 12, 267; 33, 268; 69, 319; 47.
365; 172, 370; 17 to 25, 389; 23, 412; 69, 414; 89, 415; 175, 515; 27, 555; 180, 562; 55, 606.
Delivery of Deed, 279 to 298, 106.
Delivery of Deed, 279 to 298, 106.
Delivery of Part, 171, 251.
Delusion, 205, 107.
Demand, 185, 76; 54, 365; 188, 871; 69, 462.
Demand for Possession, 145, 100.
Demurage, 108, 98; 58, 148; 171, 274; 177, 278; 182, 395; 185, 896; 28, 15; 6, 68; 235, 78; 162, 153; 44, 869; 163, 365; 164, 462; 151, 226; 73, 293; 141, 296; 83, 320; 144, 889; 163, 365; 164, 418; 163, 104, 442; 181, 466; 86, 486; 8, 506; 42, 638; 162, 662;
```

```
124, 585; 32, 604; 159, 609.

Demurrer to Evidence, 8, 43; 13, 68; 6, 316; 155, 466.

Denial, 149, 259; 59; 534; 148, 538; 162, 562.

Denial of Exact Debt, 227, 23.

Denial of Title, 122, 608.

Denying Landlord's Title, 114, 98.

Dental Operations, 142, 225.

Deposit, 19, 291; 68, 293; 103, 343; 4, 888; 82, 558.

Deposit Facto Law, 120, 416.

Deposition, 109, 98; 25, 171; 77, 294; 72, 819; 136, 345; 58, 366; 39, 60, 399; 43, 44, 483; 55, 552.

Depot Grounds, 182, 203; 165, 466.

Deputy, 210, 420.
Dental Operations, 142, 226.
Deposit Facto Law, 120, 413, 103, 343; 4, 388; 82, 558.
Deposit Facto Law, 120, 415, 103, 343; 4, 388; 82, 558.
Deposit Facto Law, 120, 415, 515, 528.
Depot Grounds, 152, 203; 165, 466.
Deputy, 210, 420.
Descent and Distribution, 90, 17; 233, 26; 103, 72; 110, 98; 77
127; 59; 148; 54, 198; 56, 298; 73, 319; 55, 418; 60, 61, 437; 187, 443; 43 to 45, 533; 534; 56, 605.
Description, 30, 69; 58, 173; 58, 175; 192, 179; 53, 198; 74, 199; 65, 222; 177, 227; 135, 228; 44, 245; 73, 246; 195, 230; 298; 70, 339; 63, 342; 104, 543; 183, 477; 64, 612, 239, 65, 222; 177, 227; 135, 228; 44, 245; 74, 246; 195, 203; 200, 208; 70, 339; 63, 342; 104, 543; 183, 477; 64, 612, 204, 650; 147, 586; 54, 606.
Description of Defendant, 58, 59, 137.
Description of Defendant, 58, 59, 137.
Description of Property, 62, 126; 13, 220; 117, 224.
Description of Property, 62, 126; 13, 220; 117, 224.
Description of Property, 62, 126; 13, 230; 117, 224.
Description of Property, 64, 147.
Destroying Article, 106, 488.
Destroying Article, 106, 488.
Destroying Property, 41, 147.
Destruction, 184, 185, 396–396.
Detention of Steamers, 37, 413.
Determining Titles, 163, 250.
Determining Titles, 164, 250.
Determining Titles, 163, 250.
Determining Titles, 164, 250.
Determining Titles, 165, 250.
Determining Titles, 165, 260.
Determining Titles, 165, 360.
Determining Titles, 165, 360.
Determining Titles, 165, 360.
Determining Titles, 165, 360
```

50, 485; 173, 491; 62, 504; 182, 508; 608.

Effect, 7, 243; 18 to 34, 268; 95, 271; 50, 298; 1 to 5, 316; 178, 587; Ejecting Passengers, 24, 412.

Ejecting Passengers, 24, 412.

Ejection, 174, 297.

Ejectment, 93, 94, 17-18; 106, 72; 289, 78; 114 to 117, 98-99, 81, 82, 127; 66, 67, 149; 114, 151; 65, 66, 173; 60, 198; 107, 109, 200; 50, 221; 4, 243; 70, 246; 41, 268; 62, 63, 293; 76, 77, 319; 75, 366; 65, 66, 32; 65, 66, 98, 127, 742; 60, 61, 413; 65, 437; 200, 443; 57, 461; 51 to 54, 485; 50, 51, 534; 106, 536; 69, 557; 62 to 64, 582; 63, 605.

Ejusdem Generis, 196, 228.

Ejection, 42, 269; 65, 46; 107 to 109, 72; 65, 96; 67, 97; 118, 131, 99; 83, 127; 68 to 70, 149; 40, 172; 34, 221; 101, 113, 224; 64, 293; 28, 318; 67, 342; 76, 366; 135, 369; 25, 389; 67, 68, 391; 1, 411; 62, 63, 414; 58, 462; 37, 485; 186, 492; 63, 510; 166, 514; 70, 71, 587; 101, 584; 59, 64, 65, 606.

Electric Heat and Vapor Governors, 111, 559.

Elements of Damage, 110, 72.

Elevators, 181, 227; 160, 394.

Elevator Values, 151, 394.

Elopement, 96, 583.

Embezzlement, 60, 61, 126; 84, 127; 43, 197; 61, 198; 47, 486; 55, 557.

Emblements, 68, 582.

Eminent Domain, 95 to 98, 18; 110 to 112, 72, 73; 51, 63, 74, 96; 119 to 121, 99; 88, 127; 71, 72, 149; 129; 151; 67, 173; 62, 198; 106, 200; 51, 221; 154, 226; 63, 64, 246; 43, 44, 269; 65 to 67, 283; 78, 79, 313; 68 to 70, 342; 77, 78, 366; 69 to 71, 391; 64, 65, 414; 66, 67, 437; 59, 462; 157, 499; 64, 65, 510; 52 to 54, 57, 534; 72, 557; 183; 56 to 70, 342; 77, 78, 366; 69 to 71, 391; 64, 65, 414; 66, 67, 487; 59, 462; 157, 499; 64, 65, 510; 52 to 54, 57, 534; 72, 557; 183; 56 to 70, 342; 77, 78, 366; 69 to 71, 391; 64, 65, 414; 64, 65, 417; 50; 163, 566.

Entry by Clerk, 172, 75.

Endorcing Decree, 112, 98.

Entry by Clerk, 172, 75.

Endorcing Decree, 112, 98.

Entry by Clerk, 172, 75.

Endy and 184; 174; 175, 187.

Equitable Assignment, 6, 267; 6, 388.

Equitable Ejectment, 69, 414.

Equitable Heject, 191, 71; 39, 591.

Equitable Mortgage, 194, 286, 197, 419.

Equitable Heject, 191, 71; 3

EQUITY—Continued.

822; 71 to 73, 342; 79, 80, 366; 65, 72 to 76, 391; 162, 395; 190, 396; 66, 67, 414; 48, 486; 68 to 70, 437; 156, 441; 200, 443; 60 to 63, 462; 81, 85, 463; 55 to 57, 486; 28, 508; 67 to 69, 510; 134, 613; 55 to 61, 534; 59, 535; 100, 536; 1, 554; 61, 657; 78 to 78, 558; 65 to 67, 582; 68, 69, 605; 74, 606.

Equity Pleading, 70, 605.

Equity Practice, 190, 396; 68, 414; 83, 558.

Equity Of Redemption, 60, 413; 78, 414; 133, 489.

Erasure, 46, 269.

Equity Practice, 190, 396; 68, 414; 83, 558.
 Equity of Redemption, 60, 413; 78, 414; 133, 489.
 Erasure, 46, 269.
 Erroneous Recitals, 108, 464.
 Error, 105, 18; 96, 98; 7, 219; 124, 248; 122, 295; 87, 320; 8, 964; 12, 435; 59, 496; 11, 509; 5, 555; 6, 7, 603; 198, 611.
 Error Abandoned, 8, 459.
 Error of Counsel, 9, 364.
 Error of Law, 64, 414.
 Error, Writ of, 64, 462.
 Escape, 153, 152; 27, 220; 106, 248; 186, 419.
 Escheat, 129, 99; 72, 173; 71, 487.
 Escrow, 287, 26; 63, 46; 78, 149; 69, 414; 23, 603; 55, 605.
 Establishment, 138, 189, 19; 80, 81, 47; 159, 100; 32, 317; 74, 366; 99, 392; 80, 487.
 Establishment, 138, 189, 19; 80, 81, 47; 159, 100; 32, 317; 74, 366; 99, 392; 80, 487.
 Estate Granted, 196, 516; 53, 582.
 Estimates, 29, 566.
 Extinguishment, 139, 384.
 Estoppel, 86, 17; 189, 22; 218, 23; 217, 220, 77; 131, 99; 96, 128; 66, 148; 79, 148; 96, 102, 169; 56, 55, 66, 221, 222; 68, 246; 51, 269; 94, 270; 88, 271; 74, 75, 298; 31, 317; 73, 319; 136, 322; 190, 192, 324; 63, 342; 96, 343; 74, 366; 81, 367; 156, 370; 12, 389; 42, 399; 10, 382; 1, 6, 41; 39, 413; 23, 435; 72, 437; 139, 440; 188, 442; 67, 641; 59, 65, 65, 66; 106, 607.
 Estoppel in Pais, 19, 171; 76, 294; 124, 440.
 Estoppel of Trustee, 289, 106.
 Estoppel, 36, 46, 37, 47, 47, 48, 76; 197, 77, 78, 79, 29; 101, 102, 108, 98; 142, 100; 171, 101; 229, 103; 229; 104; 274, 106; 66, 177; 88, 89, 78; 101, 102, 108, 98; 142, 100; 171, 101; 229, 103; 229; 104; 134; 100; 171, 101; 229, 103; 229; 104; 134; 100; 171, 101; 229, 103; 229; 104; 134; 100; 171, 101; 229, 103; 229; 104; 134; 100; 171, 101; 229, 103; 229; 104; 134; 100; 171, 101; 229; 103; 132; 109; 104; 274; 106; 66; 17

562; 44, 581.

Examination of Records, 267, 105.

Examiners, 167, 297.

Exceptions, 21, 14; 241, 24; 12, 44; 12, 94; 36, 147; 191, 204; 31, 220; 40, 221; 55, 60, 269; 4, 291; 168, 297; 50, 319; 120, 344; 123, 393; 173, 467; 52, 485; 4, 532; 64, 587; 163, 610.

Excessive Donation, 36, 268.

Excessive Levy, 277, 80.

Exchange, 167, 250; 23, 388.

Excluded Risks, 88, 199.

Excluded Risks, 88, 199.

Excluded Pricks, 88, 199.

Excluded Pricks, 88, 199.

Excluded Contract, 71, 342.

Excussive Neglect, 114, 608.

Executed Contract, 71, 342.

Exceuted Use, 107, 98.

Executed Use, 107, 98.

Execution, 118 to 121, 19; 107, 18; 61, 73, 46; 120, 121, 73; 132

to 135, 96; 90, 128, 83, 149; 36, 172; 78 to 80, 174; 72, 199; 60, 61, 62, 222; 73, 246; 107, 248; 19, 268; 56 to 59, 269; 57, 293; 79, 80, 294; 145, 296; 35, 341; 86, 87, 367; 148, 369; 76, 178, 369; 76, 438; 34, 52, 461; 63, 489; 192, 492; 136, 513; 194, 516; 66, 534; 128, 537; 154, 538; 195, 549; 18, 557; 80, 558; 75, 76, 583; 74, 606; 153, 609; 170, 610; 191, 195, 611.

```
Execution Purchaser, 94, 18.

Execution Sale, 97, 98.

Executors, 74, 46; 122, 123, 124, 73; 136 to 140, 99, 100; 28, 125; 77, 127; 91, 128; 84, 85, 149; 81 to 83, 174; 4, 196; 65, 70, 198; 63 to 66, 222; 74, 75, 246; 90, 271; 75, 293; 90 to 96; 320; 129, 321; 80, 342; 126, 344; 168, 346; 84 to 91, 367; 126, 368; 196, 371; 83 to 87, 391; 195, 396; 79 to 81, 414; 77, 78, 438; 69, 70, 422; 64 to 66, 486; 193, 515; 67 to 70, 534; 81, 82, 558; 77, 78, 583; 75 to 77, 696.

Executor and Administrator, 122; 10; 123, 19; 125, 73; 92, 128; 86 to 88, 149; 84, 88, 174; 71, 199; 67, 222; 76 to 80, 246; 247; 82, 234; 97, 300; 81 to 83, 343; 88 to 90, 332; 82, 414; 79, 80, 438; 139, 440; 193, 443; 71, 72, 462; 67, 68, 486; 71, 510; 83, 555; 78 to 81, 696.

Executor's Bond, 81, 294.

Executory Bond, 81, 294.

Executory Contract, 121, 512.

Executory Unitact, 124, 512.

Executory Trust, 158, 419.

Exemption, 124, 125, 19; 222; 23; 120, 4126, 73; 281, 106; 89, 149; 185, 144; 68, 222; 178, 227; 36, 269; 102, 271; 83, 294; 84, 343; 186, 347; 32, 367; 6, 385; 80, 391; 91 to 93, 392; 83, 416; 81, 436; 69, 466; 178, 179, 491; 2008; 77, 535; 182, 540; 84, 508; 189, 563; 97, 583; 179, 567; 178, 179, 611.

Exemplary 9, 99, 87; 179, 491; 20, 508; 77, 535; 182, 540; 84, 508; 189, 563; 97, 583; 179, 567; 178, 179, 611.

Exemplary 9, 99, 87; 179, 491; 20, 508; 77, 535; 182, 540; 84, 508; 189, 563; 97, 583; 179, 567; 178, 179, 611.

Exemplary 9, 90, 87; 171, 395.

Expended Members, 171, 386.

Expended Members, 171, 387.

Extendion of Franchise, 282, 80.

Expiration of Franchise, 282, 80.

Expiration of Franchise, 285, 86, 87; 94, 892
                                                      Facts, 67, 510.

Factors, 143, 144, 100; 94, 128; 93, 367; 73, 462; 18, 532.

Factors and Biokers, 84, 294; 84, 462; 71, 535; 86, 558; 79, 80,
Facts, 67, 510.
Factors, 143, 144, 100; 94, 128; 93, 367; 73, 462; 18, 532.
Factors and Brokers, 84, 294; 84, 462; 71, 535; 86, 558; 79, 80, 558.
Failure, 20, 146.
Failure to Appear, 11, 14.
Failure to Oclaim, 83, 294.
Failure to Colaim, 83, 294.
Failure to Colaim, 83, 294.
Failure to Deliver, 183, 227.
Failure to Enter Decree, 92, 17.
Failure to Enter Decree, 92, 17.
Failure to Instruct, 6, 580.
Failure to Title, 191, 178.
Failure to Transport, 9, 219.
Fairs, 94, 415.
False Affidavit, 85, 558.
Failse Imprisonment, 44, 172; 94, 367; 50, 461; 87, 88, 558.
False Affidavit, 85, 558.
False Pretenses, 46, 45; 62, 63, 126; 42, 147; 44, 197; 37, 245; 59, 366; 45, 390; 334, 485; 52, 599; 89, 558.
False Representations, 111, 392; 170, 514; 121, 608.
Family Pass, 193, 563.
Family Pass, 193, 563.
Family Pass, 193, 563.
Family Pass, 193, 563.
Fares, 10, 219; 178, 442.
Federal, 48, 126; 130, 417; 44, 436; 48, 509.
Federal Authority, 137, 74.
Federal Authority, 137, 74.
Federal Authority, 137, 74.
Federal Jurisdiction, 127, 238.
Federal Question, 126, 19; 169, 21; 118, 295.
Federal Guestion, 126, 19; 169, 21; 148, 295.
Federal Guestion, 126, 19; 169, 21; 148, 295.
Federal Guestion, 126, 19; 169, 21; 188, 295.
Federal Guestion, 126, 19; 169, 21; 148, 295.
Federal Guestion, 126, 19; 169, 21; 188, 295.
Federal Guestion, 126, 19; 169, 20; 23, 34, 35, 533; 15, 555; 36, 59, 59; 128, 59; 38; 39; 38; 38; 18; 565; 38; 38; 38; 38; 38; 38; 38; 38; 3
```

```
Filing Abstract, 11, 248.
Filing Bond, 9, 94.
Filing Glatm, 149, 74; 24, 94.
Filing Clatm, 149, 74; 24, 94.
Filing Clatm, 149, 74; 24, 94.
Filing List, 174, 49.
Filing List, 174, 49.
Filing List, 174, 49.
Filing List, 174, 49.
Filing Transcript, 7, 316; 7, 364; 7, 8, 411; 7, 555.
Filing Transcript, 7, 316; 7, 364; 7, 8, 411; 7, 555.
Filing Transcript, 7, 316; 7, 364; 7, 8, 411; 7, 555.
Filing Transcript, 7, 316; 7, 364; 7, 8, 411; 7, 555.
Filing Vacancies, 41, 62, 21; 231, 239, 242, 24; 7, 9, 68; 272, 106; 10, 124; 156, 322; 35, 564; 159, 596.
Finding Clatm, 188, 465.
Finding Clatm, 188, 465.
Finding Clatm, 188, 465.
Fire Limits, 158, 176; 168, 392.
Fire control Columns, 118, 489.
Fire Limits, 158, 176; 168, 392.
Fire on Pier, 178, 183.
Fire proof Safes, 189, 49.
Fire proof Safes, 189, 49.
Fire proof Safes, 189, 49.
Fire Degree, 67, 511.
Fish, 36, 5
                463. Fraudulent Conveyance, 180 to 136, 19; 255, 25; 66, 76, to 79
46, 47; 18, 69; 159, 180, to 132, 73; 146 to 148, 100; 98, 150; 90, 91, 174; 76, 199; 104, 200; 70, 74, to 77, 222, 223; 153, 250; 78, 246; 85, 86, 247; 66 to 69, 270; 91, 89, 96, 294; 101, 320; 96, 98, 867; 263, 396; 88, 90, to 98, 415; 106, 416; 90, 88, 438; 79 to 81, 99, 463; 149, 466; 72, 73, 486; 73, 76, to 78, 510; 105, 512; 75 to 78, 535; 93, 94, 558, 559; 88, 588; 92 to 96, 102, 207
```

Fraudulent Gift, 55, 221. Fraudulent Intent, 60, 319; 83, 487.

```
Praudulent Purchase, 191, 396.
Fraudulent Preference, 137, 201.
Fraudulent Representations, 25, 95; 79, 585.
Fraudulent Representatives, 182, 298.
Fraudulent Representatives, 182, 298.
Fraudulent Transaction, 22, 44.
Fraudulent Transaction, 22, 44.
Freeloid, 76, 270.
Freeling Water Mains, 115, 489.
Freeling, 186, 398.
Freight, 186, 398.
Freight, 186, 398.
Freight, 186, 398.
Fruit Trees, 53, 413.
Fugitive, 12, 340.
Full Relief, 124, 99.
Funds Drawn by Cestul Que Trust, 33, 95.
Funeral Expenses, 33, 320.
Funeral Expenses, 38, 320.
Funeral Game, 111, 488.
Future Advances, 25, 291.
Future Deliveries, 46, 70.
Gambiling, 46, 70; 88, 343; 47, 292.
Game Killed is Other States, 97, 367.
Game Laws, 97, 367.
Game Laws, 97, 367.
Gaming, 64, 71; 43, 148; 94, 150; 94, 415; 35, 485; 74, 487; 95, 569.
Gaming on Premises, 46, 147.
               Gaming on Premises, 46, 147.

Garnishee, 185, 419.

Garnishee, 185, 419.

Garnishment, 149 to 152, 100; 110, 129; 9, 196; 78, 79, 91, 223; 87, 247; 102, 271; 95 to 97, 415; 91, 438; 82, 463; 59, 486; 75, 76, 487; 79, 511; 80, 535; 96, 559; 19, 580.

Gas Machine, 116, 439.

Gate, 266, 1v5.

General Average, 165, 50; 164, 491.

General Denial, 232, 239, 78; 146, 369.

Geographical Term, 187, 615.

Gift, 211, 155; 191, 275; 74, 438; 86, 463; 80, 511; 134, 560; 89, 583.

Gift and Conveyance, 84, 487.
General Average, 185, 50; 184, 491.
General Denial, 232, 239, 78; 146, 369.
Geographical Term, 187, 615.
Gift, 211, 155; 191, 275; 74, 438; 86, 463; 80, 511; 134, 560; 89, 683.
Gift and Conveyance, 84, 487.
Good Fath, 77, 46; 112, 175.
Good Title, 47, 70.
Government, 159, 466.
Government Vessel, 24, 389.
Grade, 224, 25.
Grade Crossings, 256, 79.
Grade of Streets, 202, 76.
Grain Dealers, 25, 533.
Grand Jurors, 80, 223; 81, 585.
Grand Jury, 121, 151; 102, 175; 51, 198; 50, 318; 51, 437; 97, 659; 41, 694.
Grant, 36, 35; 125, 176; 171, 442.
Grant, 36, 35; 125, 176; 171, 442.
Granting Judge, 100, 343.
Grazing Gattie, 83, 195.
Grounds, 36, 15; 15, 532.
Ground Rent, 183, 21.
Growing Trult, 26, 883.
Growing Timber, 31, 581.
Guann, 155, 491.
Guarantor, 246, 24; 16, 196.
Guarantor, 246, 24; 16, 196.
Guarantor, 160, 50; 104, 175; 17, 220; 81, 223; 70, 71, 270; 18, 888; 81, 511.
Guarantor, 160, 50; 104, 175; 17, 20; 81, 223; 70, 71, 270; 18, 888; 81, 511.
Guarantor, 240, 24; 16, 196.
Guararian, 153, 100; 21, 317; 101, 367; 160, 539.
Guardian's Report, 13, 485.
Handewis Blocks, 145, 545.
Hand Writing, 110, 18; 74, 582.
Habeas Corpus, 68, 71; 137, 188, 74; 96, 109, 98; 157, 158; 106; 77, 199; 61, 293; 91, 343; 19, 24, 389; 50, 380; 40, 413; 93, 483; 85, 586; 111, 594.
Hearing, 142, 100; 88, 128; 24, 580.
Healeth, 93, 294.
Healith, 93, 294.
Heal Gate, 30, 389.
Hel Gatte, 30,
```

```
Holidays, 85, 223.

Homestead, 142, 143, 20: 82, 47; 141 to 144, 74; 163 to 165, 101; 96, 97, 150; 96 to 98, 174, 175; 178, 200; 86, 223; 76, 77, 270; 96 to 98, 294; 106, 302; 39, 34, 343; 100, 101, 392; 103, 104, 415; 98, 418; 98, 106, 439; 84, 435; 100, 101, 392; 103, 104, 415; 98, 418; 98, 106, 439; 84, 435; 100, 101, 392; 103, 104, 415; 98, 418; 98, 102, 103; 128, 489.

Homer Fort, 206, 208, 102, 103; 128, 489.

Homicide, 65, 67, 68, 71; 79, 80, 97; 64, 127; 81, 149; 47, 48, 712; 46, 191; 98, 40, 245; 45, 46, 222; 51, 52, 318; 105, 530; 45, 46, 64; 341; 83, 367; 55, 447; 82, 487; 87, 511; 36, 533; 88, 535; 86, 567; 102, 506; 43, 604.

Homologation, 157, 152.

Horse Race, 35, 485.

Husband of Accomplice, 59, 46.

Husband and Wife, 133, 19; 238, 26; 144 to 147, 20; 78, 47; 198, 52; 102, 72; 130, 73; 145 to 147, 74; 62, 96; 147, 106; 166 to 168, 101; 95, 99 to 101, 128; 163, 131; 81, 99 to 100, 107, 150; 95 to 101, 175; 75 to 82, 199; 47, 198; 139, 204; 86 to 88, 223; 85, 89 to 91, 248; 39, 268; 78 to 84, 270; 116, 270; 99, 100, 294, 205; 166 to 108, 329; 95 to 99, 343; 98 to 100, 367; 150, 369; 46, 399; 102 to 106, 77; 91, 105 to 108, 415; 6, 435; 96 to 101, 438; 66 to 108, 329; 95 to 99, 343; 98 to 100, 367; 150, 369; 46, 399; 102 to 106, 77; 91, 105 to 108, 415; 6, 435; 96 to 101, 438; 66 to 108, 329; 95 to 99, 343; 98 to 100, 367; 150, 369; 46, 399; 102 to 106, 77; 91, 105 to 108, 415; 6, 435; 96 to 101, 438; 66 to 108, 329; 95 to 99, 343; 98 to 100, 367; 150, 369; 46, 394; 102 to 106, 77; 91, 105 to 108, 415; 6, 435; 96 to 101, 438; 66 to 108, 329; 95 to 59, 343; 98 to 58, 587; 112, 486; 88, 89, 511; 113, 512; 65, 534; 84, 85, 535; 146, 588; 3, 555; 86, 606; 184, 611; 203, 568; 99 to 100, 583, 584.

Hydrant, 226, 77.

Hydraulic Valves, 160, 394.

Hydro-Carbon Furnace, 143, 202.

Hypothetical Statements, 240, 78.

Identification of Property, 285, 80.

Identity of Vessel, 19, 484.

Ice, 93, 895.

Ice Cream Packing, 117, 488.

Ice Factory, 182, 347.

Ingenal Condition, 41, 318.

Impleed Condition, 41, 318.

               Indeptedness, 22, 384.
Indefinite, 25, 484.
Indefinite, 25, 484.
Indefinite, 25, 484.
Indefinite, 25, 484.
Indefinite, 27, 178.
Indemnity, 92, 247, 148, 490; 184, 563; 97, 607.
Indemnitying Bond, 56, 535.
Independent Contractor, 131, 440.
Index, 168, 178.
Indian Agent, 79, 558.
Indian Reservation, 180, 567.
Indictment, 47, 45; 94, 47; 147, 50; 64, 69, 71; 81, 82, 97; 180, 101; 60, 63, 128; 70, 127; 106, 129; 48. 148; 108, 150; 53, 178; 102, 109, 175; 43, 197; 50, 198, 44, 199; 97, 98, 900; 39, 221; 109, 223; 41, 245; 117, 248; 155, 250; 182, 251; 161, 274; 47, 88, 294; 101, 122, 295; 63, 319; 100, 320; 118, 119, 321; 147, 82; 41, 341; 60, 432; 59, 366; 108, 368; 47, 52, 390, 41, 413; 94, 415; 47, 436; 51, 52, 53, 437; 107, 108, 439; 44, 461; 36, 37, 485; 87, 487; 199, 492; 56, 510; 92, 536; 54, 557; 48, 551; 101, 584; 44, 604; 98, 607.
Individual Creditor, 228, 25; 146, 609.
Individual Lability, 33, 461.
Indorsee, 152, 375.
Indorsee, 15, 38: 156, 514.
                     Individual Liability, 33, 461.
Indorsee, 162, 276.
Indorseer, 18, 388; 156, 514.
Indorseer, 18, 388; 156, 514.
Indorseer, 18, 18; 210, 22; 27, 171; 133, 201; 77, 414; 151, 441; 146, 466; 142, 469; 175, 610.
Incapacity, 32, 461.
Incest, 44, 148.
Incidental Injury, 72, 557.
Inclosure, 3, 507, 110, 536; 130, 560.
Incompetency, 206, 103; 61, 557.
Incompetency, 206, 103; 61, 557.
Incompetent Fellow servant, 125, 249.
Inconporation 78, 46; 167, 203; 161, 226; 158, 490.
Incorporation 78, 44, 126.
Increase, 130, 585.
Increase of Risk, 97, 247.
```

```
Incubator Building, 157, 75.
Inculpating Acts, 77, 17.
Incumbent, 26, 77.
Incumbering, 188, 251.
Incumberance, 157, 20; 86, 47; 175, 101; 40, 197; 68, 246; 116, 272; 106, 559
272; 106, 559.
     Infancy, 187, 76; 169; 101; 166, 153; 100, 321; 113, 344; 106, 392; 128, 440; 145, 466; 90, 511; 103, 586. Infant, 148, 20; 83, 47; 101, 150; 110, 321; 101, 367; 160, 539; 99, 607.
  128, 537; 10, 603; 105, 343; 85, 391; 114, 393; 144, 49
587.
Interest of Party, 88, 487.
Interested Commerce, 180, 51; 105, 150; 107, 108, 584.
Interference, 144, 345.
Interlocutory Order, 155, 538.
   Interlocutory Order, 155, 538.

Intermarriage, 51, 71.

Intermingling, 129, 608.

Intermixture, 122, 512.

Internal Revenue, 104, 512.

Interpleader, 92, 47; 78, 149; 1, 219; 74, 246; 32, 365.

Interpretation, 58, 59, 16; 16, 267; 32, 292; 38, 436.

Interrogatories, 186, 251.

Interruption by Arbitration, 125, 368.

Intervenors, 86, 391.

Intervenors, 86, 391.
```

Intervention, 27, 125; 1 96; 16, 340; 178, 442; 105, 512; 11, 608.

```
Intestate Leaving only Nieces and Nephews, 56, 605.
Intoxication, 181, 587.
In
```

```
JURY-Continued.
47, 581; 89, 583; 121, 584; 141, 585; 169, 587; 132, 608; 142,
609.

101.

102.

103.

104.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

105.

106.

106.

107.

107.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

108.

          699.

Jury Trial, 213, 103; 45, 148; 117, 175; 31, 244; 175, 562; 138, 885; 163, 610.

Justice, 16, 14; 20, 94; 116, 129; 111 to 114, 248; 102, 103, 271; 127, 221; 177, 386; 12, 411; 6, 484; 54, 510; 101, 536; 8, 555;
```

```
Liability of Assignee, 103, 48.
Liability for Dobs, 198, 101.
Liability for Lose, 164, 100.
Liability for Lose, 46, 15.
Liability for Surety, 162, 250; 21, 460.
Liability for Surety, 162, 250; 21, 460.
Liability for Surety, 162, 250; 121, 450.
Liability for Surety, 162, 250; 121, 121, 368; 130, 593; 119, 464; 123, 585; 127, 128, 569.
Libel and Slander, 178, 123, 259; 120, 121, 138, 248.
License, 162, 160, 20; 179, 21; 105, 48; 160, 75; 227, 78; 222, 223; 144, 265; 91, 271; 140, 273; 191, 298; 178, 333; 185, 234; 122, 368; 159, 394; 122, 416; 201, 420; 58, 483, 126; 129, 489; 107, 115, 512; 114, 357; 124, 555; 126, 608.
License to Railroads, 164, 250.
License to
```

```
MANDAMUS—Continued.
272; 187, 196, 275; 129, 296; 132, 321; 140, 322; 40, 341; 39, 365; 159, 175, 370; 130, 440; 58, 462; 124, 465; 162, 466; 9, 535; 136, 137, 560; 130, 131, 585.

Mandate, 11, 94; 169, 178; 113, 224.

Manslaughter, 46, 148; 48, 390.

Marufacture, 289, 104, 390.

Marine Insurance, 204, 102; 125, 465.

Marine Torts, 131, 176.

Maritime Lien, 111, 112, 48; 205, 206, 103; 122, 129; 42, 365; 134, 395; 126 to 129, 465; 128, 129, 489; 123, 124, 512; 116, 537; 138, 560.

Mark, 195, 540.
Manufacture, 289, 104.
Marine Insurance, 204, 102; 125, 465.

Marine Torts, 131, 175.

Marine Torts, 131, 176.

Markets, 123, 225; 128, 212, 489; 123, 124, 512; 116, 537; 138, 566, 560.

Markets, 123, 225; 125, 272.

Marriage Contract, 184, 132.

Marriage Promise, 155, 76.

Marriage Promise, 155, 76.

Marriage Settlement, 167, 101.

Master, 06, 236.

Marshall's Fees, 4, 485.

Masonic Building, 179, 611.

Master and Servant, 196 to 191, 22; 118 to 117, 48; 196, 76; 207 to 209, 103; 123, 124, 129; 134, 135, 151; 132, 133, 176; 176, 178; 115 to 119, 131, 200, 201; 114, 115, 224; 125 to 127, 138, 249; 85, 294; 129 to 131, 143, 296; 124, 125, 344; 127, 396; 135, 136, 333; 139 to 141, 447; 131 to 133, 440; 130 to 132, 446; 135, 135, 333, 139 to 141, 447; 131 to 133, 440; 130 to 132, 446; 125, 441; 127, 368; 135, 136, 368.

Masuring, 106, 448; 118, 446.

Maturing Debt, 120, 489.

Mayhem, 01, 46; 56, 97; 51, 413.

Measure of Damages, 96, 97, 18; 244, 77; 139, 273; 56, 390; 194, 449; 175, 515; 151, 561; 160, 610.

Masure of Liability, 175, 274.

Mechanic's Lien, 192, 22; 118, 48; 187, 76; 125, 126, 129; 136, 162; 134, 176; 120, 211; 203; 116, 117, 224; 129, 240; 138, 321; 134, 136; 130, 131, 130, 130; 136, 136.

Medicline, 134, 465.

Meetings of Directors, 50, 96.

Membership, 106, 607.

Memorandum, 128, 18; 68, 46; 83, 247; 90, 294; 78, 535.

Mental Suffering, 190, 291; 151, 661.

Mesure Profits, 63, 686.

Membership, 106, 607.

Mesure Profits, 63, 686.

Minor, 114, 49, 805.

Minor, 114, 49, 134, 467, 134.

Misonduct of Autorney, 10, 388.

Misonduct of Payment, 147, 18.

Modeline, 194, 194,
```

```
New Trial, 13, 14; 94, 18; 212, 28; 151, 152, 50; 68, 70; 74, 71; 225, 100; 68, 127; 113, 129; 145, 130; 160, 131; 152, 152; 90; 161, 171; 189, 177; 40, 221; 61, 245; 33, 140, 249; 157, 250; 150, 273; 6, 291; 120, 225; 169, 297; 42, 318; 32, 340; 136, 137, 345; 174, 418; 9, 485; 153, 441; 166, 167, 442; 11, 460; 151, 460; 9, 12, 506; 97, 536; 6, 500; 406; 86, 605; 134, 143, 144, 609.

Newly-discovered Evidence, 116, 151.

Newspaper, 68, 366.

Next Friend, 160, 1559.

Night Heasting, 190, 347.

Nolle Pros., 35, 45; 38, 485.

Nunc Pro Tunc Entry, 39, 485.

Non-entringement, 150, 277.

Non-indipity, 135, 290; 162, 241.

Non-indipity, 135, 290; 162, 241.

Non-indipity, 135, 290; 162, 241.

Non-navigable Stream, 174, 293.

Non-navigable Stream, 174, 293.
```

```
Opening Street, 111, 73,
Open Policy, 89, 271.
Opera, 115, 512.
Opera, 115, 512.
Operating on Other Roads, 131, 465.
Opinion, 112, 18; 170, 51; 174, 135; 64, 72, 246; 47, 461; 67, 462; 37, 587; 187; 187, 502.
Opinion Evidence, 79, 391.
Option, 294, 107; 170, 491; 95, 859.
Opinion Evidence, 79, 391.
Option, 294, 107; 170, 491; 95, 859.
Oral Arcement, 73, 488.
Oral Arcement, 73, 488.
Oral Arcement, 73, 488.
Oral Authority, 86, 583.
Oral Trust, 189, 203.
Oral Charge, 74, 535.
Oral Trust, 189, 203.
Order, 19, 14; 165, 21; 17, 124; 9, 171; 10, 243; 57, 269; 112, 296; 58, 411; 52, 483; 10, 400; 9, 485.
Oral Charge, 74, 535.
Oral Trust, 189, 203.
Order, 19, 14; 165, 21; 17, 124; 9, 171; 10, 243; 57, 269; 112, 296; 68, 411; 52, 483; 10, 400; 9, 485.
Oral Charge, 74, 535.
Oral Trust, 189, 203.
Order, 19, 14; 165, 21; 17, 124; 9, 171; 10, 243; 57, 269; 112, 296; 68, 411; 52, 483; 10, 400; 9, 485.
Oral Charge, 74, 535.
Oral Trust, 189, 484.
Order Instance, 204, 77; 78, 199; 137, 249; 138, 296; 31, 340; 138, 499; 138, 206; 31, 340; 138, 499; 138, 206; 31, 340; 138, 499; 138, 206; 31, 340; 138, 499; 137, 248, 499; 138, 296; 31, 340; 138, 499; 137, 249; 138, 296; 31, 340; 138, 499; 137, 249; 138, 296; 31, 340; 138, 499; 137, 249; 138, 296; 31, 340; 138, 499; 138, 499; 137, 248, 499; 138, 296; 31, 340; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 137, 248, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 138, 499; 13
```

```
PATENTS—Continued.

142 to 150, 345; 160, 370; 41, 390; 150 to 161, 394; 169, 395; 155 to 158, 418; 169, 442; 124, 469; 162, 589; 113, 559; 147, 669.

Patent Ability, 116, 393; 155, 418.

Patents and Copyrights, 192, 102.

Patents for Inventions, 225, 235 to 238, 104; 154, 131.

Patent Right, 231, 104.

Patentability, 149, 345; 100, 464; 110, 111, 112, 113, 488; 111, 512.
Patents for Separate Parts, 238, 104.
Patentability, 149, 345; 100, 464; 110, 111, 112, 113, 488; 111, 512.
Patentee, 161, 370.
Patentee, 161, 370.
Patrol Company, 21, 533.
Pauper, 155, 202.
Paving Streets, 134, 130.
Paying Claims, 75, 246.
Paying Streets, 134, 130.
Paying Claims, 75, 246.
Paying Money into Court, 1, 219.
Paying Taxes, 286, 106; 131, 130.
Payment, 226, 23; 144, 50; 184, 51; 151, 74; 243, 78; 120, 99; 131, 151; 158, 152; 123, 176; 149, 177; 121, 201; 147, 202; 147, 249; 161, 297; 136, 365; 86, 367; 146, 369; 180, 181, 191, 371; 136, 417; 158, 441; 147, 148, 514; 99, 112, 536; 143, 538; 118, 560; 158, 159, 561; 159, 174, 562; 126, 129, 585; 145, 146, 586.
Payment to Attorney, 25, 125.
Payment of Debts, 145, 490.
Payment of Money, 193, 154.
Payment of Part, 245.
Payment of Taxes, 126, 15; 160, 251.
Pecuniary Damages, 52, 582.
Peddlers, 239, 104; 159, 441.
Penal Action, 258, 79; 115, 129.
Penal Bond, 161, 153; 70, 270.
Penalties, 61, 342; 72; 127; 46, 245; 88, 294; 124, 295; 196, 298; 72, 319; 176, 442; 167, 491.
Pending Motion to Dismiss Amendment, 113, 151.
Penitentiary Guard, 18, 603.
Peris of the Sea, 204, 102; 175, 467.
Performance of Duty, 110, 48.
Perfury, 55, 46; 49, 245; 57, 342; 47, 461; 144, 538; 50, 581.
Performance of Duty, 110, 48.
Perfury, 55, 46; 49, 245; 57, 342; 47, 461; 144, 538; 50, 581.
Performance of Duty, 110, 48.
Perfury, 55, 46; 49, 245; 57, 342; 47, 461; 144, 538; 50, 581.
Performance of Duty, 110, 48.
Perfury, 55, 46; 49, 245; 57, 342; 47, 461; 144, 538; 50, 581.
Performance of Duty, 110, 48.
Perfury, 55, 46; 49, 245; 57, 572; 210, 77; 4, 94; 36, 125; 127, 249, 148, 250; 185, 251; 124, 272; 2, 339; 103, 392; 58, 437; 94, 438, 438, 436.
Personal Liability, 37, 461.
Personal Property, 179, 587.
     249, 148, 200; 189, 251; 124, 272; 2, 339; 103, 352; 58, 437; 94, 438, Personal Liability, 37, 461. Personal Property, 179, 587. Personal Representative, 121, 129. Personality, 181, 51; 68, 222. Personation, 89, 558. Persons not a Party, 53, 70. Perversion, 170, 323. Petition, 98, 18; 122, 531. Petition for Homestead, 13, 44. Physician, 262, 79; 89, 128; 161, 131; 144, 226; 162, 297; 141, 369; 98, 607. Physicians and Surgeons, 160, 441. Pictures, 40, 380. Pilot Commissioners, 139, 345. Peace, 44, 318.
Physicians and Surgeons, 160, 441.

Pictures, 40, 380.

Pilot Commissioners, 139, 345.

Peace, 44, 318.

Place of Record, 42, 96.

Place of Sale, 180, 101; 195, 102.

Placers, 119, 48.

Plaintiff, 96, 72.

Plaintiff's Character, 178, 21.

Plaintiff's Residence, 162, 75.

Plea, 41, 45; 50, 245; 61, 319; 59, 534; 1, 579.

Plea in Bar, 53, 221; 66, 582.

Plea of Guilty, 40, 485.

Plea in Mitgation, 238, 78.

Pleading, 61, 16; 172, 121; 227 to 234, 123, 24; 182, 49; 145, 50; 111, 115, 73; 162, 177, 75; 229 to 243, 78; 177, 101; 240 to 247, 104; 155 to 168, 131; 55, 64, 148; 99, 150; 135, 151; 150 to 168, 152, 153; 196, 154; 4, 171; 45, 172; 100, 121, 175; 160 to 163, 177; 102, 200; 145, 148 to 163, 202; 171, 203; 16, 220; 53, 221; 89, 223; 109, 224; 126, 139, 225; 145 to 151, 256; 156, 228; 76, 246; 149 to 161, 163, 250; 187, 251 11, 267; 114, 272; 144 to 143, 273; 62, 71, 72, 200; 143, 205; 163, 164, 172, 297; 198, 298; 119, 124, 321; 152 to 168, 322; 133, 143, 345; 151, 157, 167, 345, 346; 197, 347; 1, 363; 21, 364; 142 to 147, 399; 182 to 165, 385; 169 to 167, 418; 63, 437; 132, 449; 141, 150, 441; 161 to 164, 441, 442; 44, 461; 119 464; 150 to 152, 466; 186, 467; 63, 455; 169 to 167, 418; 63, 437; 132, 449; 141, 150, 441; 161 to 164, 441, 442; 44, 461; 119 464; 150 to 152, 566; 186, 461; 161 to 167, 481; 63, 687; 74, 558; 147, 515; 60, 61, 584; 145 to 152, 585; 140, 584; 123, 568; 147, 51; 160 to 163, 562; 192, 563; 40, 581; 101, 584; 123, 568; 144, 561; 160 to 165, 562; 192, 563; 40, 581; 101, 584; 123, 568; 147, 51 to 156, 586; 149 to 152, 609; 162, 610.

Pleading Disclatmer, 75, 449.

Pleading Disclatmer, 75, 449.

Pleading Disclatmer, 75, 449.

Pleading Disclatmer, 78, 449
```

```
Police Nippers, 105, 488.
Police Power, 218, 103; 24, 244; 37, 436,
Policy, 158, 75; 104, 105, 295; 104, 343; 112, 113, 396; 102, 511.
Polygamy, 48, 461.
Ponds, 190, 611.
Poor, 244, 78; 150, 524.
Poor Debtor, 245, 78.
Poor Laws, 252, 24; 148, 50; 154 to 156, 202; 159, 323; 7, 484.
Poor and Poor Laws, 154, 250; 160, 323; 168, 418; 153, 466; 183, 563.
     Free-existing Debts, 95, 245, 161, 177; 10, 196; 140, 202; 86, 271; 135, 273; 141, 346; 91, 416; 36, 461; 94, 463; 77, 510; 16, 17, 580.

Preference by Contract, 16, 460.

Preference by Stockholder, 30, 125.

Performance, 60, 16.

Prejudice, 46, 604.

Prejudice, 46, 604.

Prejudice of Juror, 152, 369.

Preliminary Examination, 64, 366.

Preliminary Injunction, 143, 49.

Premaiure, 171, 491.

Premeditation, 39, 245.

Premium, 108, 295.

Presseriptive Title, 183, 76.

Presseriptive Title, 183, 76.

Pressence of Accused, 88, 72.

Pressence of Defendant, 89, 72.

Pressentent on of Claim, 27, 484.

Pressentment, 72, 462; 97, 559.

Pressentment, 73, 462; 116, 44; 105, 72; 136, 74; 16, 17, 94; 232, 104; 103, 128; 116, 129; 32, 33, 147; 169, 177; 121, 201; 151, 295; 22, 244; 97, 271; 114, 272; 10, 317; 57, 318; 69, 319; 89, 230; 79, 342; 30, 364; 140, 389; 25, 435; 186, 443; 51, 461; 197, 492; 109, 536; 143, 536; 158, 150, 561, 562; 11, 580; 145, 146, 586.

Pretended Sale, 13, 201.

Price, 266, 79; 278, 166; 162, 274; 191, 468.

Primar Pate Title, 192, 154.

Primary Liability, 201, 76.

Primiry Liability, 301, 76.

Primiry Liability, 301, 76.

Principal, 111, 512.

Principal and Agent, 155, 56; 151, 158, 20; 245 to 246, 25; 161, 163, 131; 168, 153; 162, 177; 160 to 161, 202; 155, 156, 226; 161, 260; 184, 155, 369, 370; 13, 388; 187, 466; 100, 488; 122, 103, 346; 106, 370; 176, 177, 149; 129, 440; 166, 442; 158, 666; 154, 155, 649; 172, 622; 161, 162, 588.

Principal and Agent, 185, 56; 164, 442; 185, 666; 154, 155, 699; 175, 679; 174, 192; 178, 401; 166, 442; 185, 666; 154, 155, 699; 171, 670; 174, 192; 172, 672; 164, 642; 185, 666
```

Prior Grants, 163, 177.
Prior Infringements, 134, 49.
Prior Policy, 109, 295.
Prior Selzure by State Court, 166, 274.
Prior Use, 161, 395, 114; 560.
Priortites, 111, 48; 171, 75; 182, 99; 215, 103; 90, 125; 37, 292; 160, 297; 128, 140, 141, 468; 17, 484; 128, 513; 44, 534; 127, 537; 127, 608.
Prisoner, 118, 439.
Private Account, 21, 485.
Private Creditors, 139, 369.
Private Embankment, 63, 510.
Private Embankment, 63, 510.
Private Examination, 86, 606.
Private Examination, 86, 606.
Private Ramination, 86, 848.
Proceeding, 81, 47; 3, 483.
Proceeding, 81, 47; 3, 483.
Proceeding at Law, 85, 416.
Process, 166, 518; 200, 178; 163, 200; 96, 223; 1, 243; 19, 244; 155, 273; 111, 344; 157, 370; 168, 395; 76, 487; 90, 511; 160, 539; 19, 560.
Processing, 22, 460.
Production of Paper, 110, 344.
Production Books, 157, 539.
Production of Paper, 110, 344.
Production Paper, 10, 460.
Profits, 37, 197; 136, 225; 41, 485.
Prohibition, 100, 200; 156, 274.
Promise to Pay Another's Debt, 86, 415; 90, 606.
Promise to Pay Firm Debt, 152, 177.
Promissory Note, 248, 241, 68, 170, 153; 149, 177; 34, 197; 34, 233; 90, 367; 158, 370; 96, 489; 156, 514.
Promote to Pay Firm Debt, 152, 177.
Promissory Note, 248, 241, 68, 170, 153; 149, 177; 34, 197; 94, 233; 90, 367; 158, 370; 96, 489; 156, 514.
Proof of Claim, 91, 189.
Proof of Claim, 91, 189.
Proof of Claim, 91, 189.
Proof of Fareution, 78, 391.
Proof of Fareution, 79, 391.
Proof of Fareution, 79, 391.
Problem Debt, 162, 179, 449; 169 to 172, 442; 159 to 161, 466; 69, 510; 157, 158; 514; 161 to 163, 539; 26, 555; 173, 174, 562, 163, 164, 568; 157, 610. Merchant, 107, 320. Public Merchant, 107, 320. Public Place, 74, 487. Public Policy, 34, 69; 98, 128; 27, 28, 244; 60, 246; 37, 318; 104, 439; 27, 533; 38, 556; 27, 604. Public or Private, 123, 385. Public School House, 131, 489. Public School House, 131, 489. Public School House, 131, 489. Public Use, 260, 79; 56, 245; 67, 487. Public Works, 39, 584. Public Use, 260, 79; 56, 245; 67, 487. Public Works, 39, 551. Publication, 199, 52; 117, 248; 161, 166, 323; 198, 324; 71, 437; 32, 461; 47, 485. Publication Statute, 21, 146. Pulling Down, 86, 394. Punishment, 42, 126; 37, 288. Punishment of Claim, 29, 533. Punitive Damages, 170, 51; 52, 57; 390. Purchase, 175, 21, 163, 50; 91, 138; 77, 228; 36, 245; 84, 270; 122, 321; 189, 347; 87, 363; 180, 467. Purchase by Agent, 57, 486. Purchase of Interest, 244, 25. Purchase of Land, 188, 428. Purchase of Land, 188, 428. Purchase Money, 296, 107; 181, 467. Purchase Money, 296, 107; 181, 467. Purchase Price, 20, 69; 15, 291.

Real Property, 184, 21.
Realty, 137, 96; 158, 177; 78, 222; 32, 365; 49, 534; 85, 535; 178, 552.
Reasonable Doubt, 78, 71; 51, 173; 83, 535.
Reasonable Bate, 29, 508.
Reasonable Time, 182, 132.
Reasonable Time, 182, 132.
Reasonable Use, 199, 347.
Rebuttal, 121, 201; 188, 159, 561, 562.
Recalling, 216, 185.
Recalling Witness, 54, 245.
Recalling Witness, 54, 245.
Receipt, 119, 129; 147, 202.
Receipt and Acceptance, 129, 19.
Receiver, 48, 16; 258, 24; 255, 257, 79; 241, 104; 87, 128; 120, 151; 173, 153; 171, 203; 170, 251; 33, 412; 40, 436; 54, 63, 462; 163, 466; 16, 484; 176, 491; 161, 514; 155, 538; 164, 539; 43, 556; 121, 590; 171, 587; 162, 610.
Receiving Freight, 31, 69.
Receiving Freight, 31, 69.
Receiving Stolen Goods, 79, 71; 27, 268; 49, 390.
Receiving Stolen Goods, 79, 71; 27, 268; 49, 390.
Receiving Stolen Goods, 79, 71; 27, 268; 49, 390.
Receiving Stolen Goods, 76, 714.
Recklessness, 142, 322.
Recognition by State, 36, 197.
Recognition 49, 15.
Recognition 19, 72.
Recognition 19, 72.
Recognition 19, 73.
Reconsideration, 161, 101.
Reconveyance, 28, 463.
Record, 80, 17; 189, 19; 14, 44; 73, 46; 12, 68; 268, 145; 77, 79, 11, 73, 74, 388; 80, 473.
Reconveyance, 28, 463.
Record, 80, 17; 189, 19; 14, 44; 73, 46; 12, 68; 268, 145; 77, 79, 11, 78, 298; 10, 18, 14, 217; 57, 318; 137, 322; 6, 339; 23, 346; 16, 47, 344; 3, 388; 80, 67, 391; 12, 445; 152, 442; 94, 463; 152, 156, 466; 10, 11, 18, 506; 61, 506; 6, 7, 8, 632; 31, 635; 101, 635; 61, 608; 61, 506; 67, 78, 632; 11, 635; 101, 635; 64, 688.
Recording, 62, 46; 39, 69; 22, 317; 175, 346; 18, 484; 14, 582; 32, 484.
Recording, 62, 46; 39, 69; 22, 317; 175, 346; 18, 484; 14, 582; 32, 484.
Recording, 62, 46; 39, 69; 22, 317; 175, 346; 18, 484; 14, 582; 32, 484. 881. Recording Certificate, 136, 176. Recount of Votes, 65, 46. Recovering Money, 92, 49. Recovery, 29, 533.

```
Recovery of Land, 246, 104.
Recovery of Money Paid, 96, 536.
Recovery of Payments, 177, 227.
Recovery of Real Estate. 128, 99.
Redelivery Bond, 76, 438.
Redemption, 277, 95; 120 to 122, 49; 185, 51; 194 to 196, 76; 276, 89; 122, 123, 201; 117, 272; 181, 333; 190, 443; 142, 465; 33, 509; 134, 135, 131; 125, 537; 190, 563; 74, 606.
Redundancy, 146, 226.
Redenter, 12, 94.
Reference, 23, 14; 256, 105; 11, 317; 163, 323; 149, 466; 153, 154, 514; 165, 539; 96, 559; 96, 558; 66, 582; 163, 510.
Refining, 34, 509.
Reformation, 101, 72; 98, 247; 112, 416.
Reformation of Deed, 67, 46; 50, 289; 72, 342; 76, 558.
Reforming Deed, 60, 534.
Reforming Instrument, 62, 462.
Refunding Bonds, 124, 73; 77, 127.
Refusal of Continuance, 51, 245.
Refusal of Continuance, 51, 245.
Refusal of Continuance, 51, 245.
Refusing New Trial, 17, 124.
Register of Deeds, 357, 105.
Registering Degla, 154, 166, 539; 113, 559.
Registering Degla, 154, 166, 539; 113, 559.
Registering Degla, 154, 166, 539; 113, 559.
Regulating Degla, 154, 166, 539; 134, 583; 103, 536.
Relimbursement, 278, 89; 189, 396.
Relimbursement, 28, 29; 508.
Relimbursement, 29, 124; 160, 346; 174, 419, 419, 419, 419, 419, 419, 419,
              305; 174 to 180, 442; 186, 486; 146 to 159, 480; 163 to 165; 514.

Removal of Note, 155, 490.
Removing Mortgaged Property, 58, 319.
Removing Property, 13, 186; 98, 223; 70, 413.
Removing Property, 13, 186; 98, 223; 70, 413.
Rendition, 109, 248; 112, 368.
Renewal, 129, 176.
Renewal of Judgment, 274, 178.
Renewal of Judgment, 274, 178.
Renewal of Lense, 102, 48.
Renewing Stock, 26, 292.
Rent, 290, 26; 125, 161; 109, 200; 116 to 120, 948; 104, 271; 132, 417; 117, 464; 136, 513; 179, 516; 86, 535.
Rent, 200, 26; 125, 161; 109, 200; 116 to 120, 948; 104, 271; 132, 417; 117, 464; 136, 513; 179, 516; 86, 535.
Renewing Stock, 26, 292.
Rent, 200, 26; 125, 161; 164.
Reopening, 34, 174; 61, 462; 120, 488.
Reopening Case, 152, 273; 161, 346.
Reopening Case, 152, 273; 161, 346.
Reopaning Sidewalks, 137, 174, 191.
Repairs, 178, 76; 219, 103; 238, 104; 122, 129; 39, 197; 129, 296; 38, 305; 30, 526; 272, 588.
Repairing Sidewalks, 147, 417.
Repayment, 182, 515.
Repayment of Surety, 162, 586.
Repeal, 179, 178; 104, 348; 110, 271; 198, 347; 176, 539.
Replevin, 261, 25; 254; 264, 97; 289 to 271, 105; 173 to 177; 132; 174, 175, 153; 171, 172; 20, 186; 172, 173, 205; 160 to 183, 226; 170, 261; 58, 287; 177, 297; 188, 370; 6, 388; 175 to 177, 355; 167, 418; 181, 419; 181, 442; 167, 467; 20, 508; 45, 509; 89, 511; 166 to 170, 514; 167, 539.
```

```
Replevy Bond, 19, 44.
Report, 163, 323; 165, 539.
Report of Commissioners, 150, 322.
Report of Master, 9, 484.
Representation, 79, 149; 81, 247; 174, 370; 42, 485; 59, 486; 147, 561.
   Report of Commissioners, 150, 322.
Report of Master, 9, 484.
Representation, 79, 140; 81, 247; 174, 370; 42, 485; 59, 486; 147, 561.
Representation, 79, 140; 81, 247; 174, 370; 42, 485; 59, 486; 147, 561.
Repursation, 80, 52.
Republication, 190, 52.
Repuplanary, 48, 271.
Repugnant Habendum Clause, 54, 582.
Reputation, 37, 221; 33, 341.
Requirements, 11, 291.
Requisites, 250, 105; 16, 582; 51, 534.
Res Adjudionta, 167, 21; 107, 22; 237, 25; 96, 47; 187, 188, 102; 272, 106; 112, 129; 114, 115, 151; 118, 175; 105, 200; 104, 105, 224; 116, 235; 191, 298; 124, 321, 171, 322; 117, 344; 113, 508; 126, 116, 121, 122, 440; 160, 466; 65, 486; 119, 488; 121, 122, 440; 160, 466; 65, 486; 119, 488; 121, 122, 440; 160, 466; 65, 486; 119, 488; 121, 122, 489; 187, 147, 100, 336; 139, 539; 137, 19 119, 560; 116, 116, 684; 122, 685; 111, 118, 608; 133, 608.
Resclasion, 84, 47; 29, 95; 77, 149; 124, 201; 166, 227; 33, 292; 182, 298; 38, 318; 80, 319; 71, 342; 170, 370; 179, 335; 194, 596; 68 to 70, 457; 183, 342; 29, 469; 67, 486; 169 to 171, 514; 61, 384; 79, 535; 195, 563.
Rescission of Sale, 147, 132.
Reservation, 178, 297; 66, 319; 200, 420; 17, 555.
Reservation of Lien, 214, 102.
Reservation of Lien, 214, 102.
Reservation of Lien, 214, 102.
Reservation of Lien, 271; 159, 490.
Resignation, 132, 249; 83, 558.
Resisting Arrest, 79, 97.
Responsibility, 172, 274; 31, 389.
Restoration, 167, 177.
Restraints, 196, 516.
Restraints of Trade, 55, 96; 25, 147; 29, 244; 34, 292; 32, 412: 27, 604.
Restriction, 196, 275.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173, 174, 51; 91, 247; 193, 396; 187, 467; 188, 611.
Resulting, 173,
```

```
Risk, 167, 227; 109, 295; 117, 321; 106, 368; 133, 440.
Risk of Business, 120, 537.
Risk of Eumployment, 124, 129; 133, 176.
Robbery, 161, 274; 81, 414; 40, 533; 59, 557.
Robbery, 161, 274; 81, 414; 40, 533; 59, 557.
Royalty, 41, 221; 130, 249; 112, 439.
Running of Statute, 131, 821; 132, 560.
Rule, 19 to 52, 486.
Rule of Court, 12, 14.
Rule in Shelley's Case, 196, 443.
Ruling out Answer, 12, 460.
Rulings Below, 5, 196.
Safety Funds, 39, 365.
Sailing Vessel, 33, 486.
Sailing Vessel, 33, 486.
Sailing Vessel, 33, 486.
Sailing Vessel, 38, 486, 55, 70; 163, 72; 197, 198; 76; 261 to 266, 79; 277, 278, 279, 89; 144, 100; 274, 275, 106; 151, 131; 175 to 178, 132; 96, 150; 141, 162; 176, 177, 183; 188, 189, 154; 290; 178, 177, 183; 188, 189, 154; 290; 178, 177, 175, 176, 203; 182, 157, 204; 17, 220; 62, 222; 119, 224; 160, 164 to 167, 226, 227; 73, 79, 246; 171 to 173, 251; 54, 59, 269; 131, 272; 162, 274; 10, 25, 291; 180 to 183, 288; 49, 49, 5102, 389); 163, 179, 180, 182, 183, 323; 189, 324; 29, 340; 79, 80, 342; 174 to 173, 346, 72, 186, 331; 189, 383; 189, 89; 184, 495; 102, 389; 104, 199; 178, 371; 5, 389; 81, 49, 489; 127, 491; 120 to 184, 442; 189, 443; 122, 142, 465; 188, 169, 467; 62, 486; 125, 469; 149, 153, 490; 172, 491; 89, 511; 133, 137, 140, 518; 149, 168 to 171, 514; 13, 582; 70, 555; 96, 536; 126, 128, 537; 171, 172, 539; 173, 180, 181, 52; 97, 585; 188, 169, 467; 62, 486; 128, 469; 149, 153, 490; 172, 491; 89, 511; 133, 137, 140, 518; 149, 168 to 171, 514; 13, 582; 70, 555; 96, 536; 126, 129, 537; 171, 172, 539; 173, 180, 181, 52; 97, 585; 178, 187, 587; 195, 588; 74, 60; 91, 607; 167 to 170, 610; 181, 611.

Sale of Matela, 129, 19.
Sale on Credit, 192, 76.
Sale of Goods, 129, 19; 24, 171.
Sale in Haste, 135, 19.
Sale of Land, 249, 105; 64, 222; 81, 247; 75, 391; 78, 583.
Sale of Land, 249, 105; 64, 222; 81, 247; 75, 391; 78, 583.
Sale of Land, 249, 105; 64, 222; 81, 247; 75, 391; 78, 583.
Sale of Cand to Pay Debts, 81, 606.
Sale of Order, 192, 79.
Sale of Goods, 129, 19; 24, 171.
Sale in Haste, 135,
             School District, 70, 149; 182, 227; 178, 370; 172, 173, 515; 171, 610.

School Fund, 173, 515.

School Lands, 163, 164, 50; 84, 320; 172, 823; 187, 347; 176, 370.

School and School District, 183, 563.

School Trustee, 180, 182.

Schoel Trustee, 180, 182.

Schoel Trustee, 180, 182.

Scope of Authority, 163, 131.

Scope of Business, 149, 580.

Screens, 103, 248.

Scal, 176, 178; 152, 345; 157, 441; 154, 538.

Scal, 176, 178; 152, 345; 157, 441, 518.

Scamen's Wages, 166, 274.

Scaw-worthiness, 186, 443.

Scarch, 28, 604.

Sceond Appleation, 106, 416.

Second Appleation, 106, 416.

Second Judgment, 59, 317.

Second Trial, 36, 221.

Sceond Trial, 36, 221.

Sceondary Evidence, 114, 300.

Sceondary Froof, 36, 222.

Secretary of Interior, 172, 442.

Scecret Preparation, 41, 221.

Scecret Preparation, 41, 221.

Scecret Trust, 77, 556.

Scecurity, 181, 347; 35, 412; 169, 418; 41, 486; 194, 462.

Scecurity, 181, 347; 35, 412; 169, 418; 41, 486; 194, 462.

Scecurity, 181, 347; 35, 412; 169, 418; 41, 486; 194, 462.

Scecurity of Cost, 42, 436.

Scecurity, 181, 347; 35, 412; 169, 418; 41, 486; 194, 462.
```

```
Seizure by Officers, 270, 105.
Selection of Arbitrator, 8, 196.
Selection of Arbitrator, 8, 196.
Self defense, 80, 91, 79; 64, 127; 46, 148; 40, 245; 19, 317; 52, 318; 105, 320; 25, 366; 82, 487.
Selling Real Estate, 74, 146.
Selling Vote, 76, 366
Sentence, 164, 75; 71, 127; 60, 390; 50, 505.
Sentence for Lesser Orime, 62, 70.
Separable Controversy, 260, 25; 160, 274; 169, 250; 180, 442.
Separate Confessions, 88, 245.
Separate Confessions, 88, 245.
Separate Debts, 97, 271.
Separate Estate, 146, 20; 71, 70; 105, 98; 168, 101; 1101, 128; 81, 199; 89, 257; 99, 100, 294, 255; 126, 368; 105, 391; 108, 416; 98 to 100, 439; 98, 90, 463; 99, 584.
Separate Funds, 587, 80.
Separate Maintainance, 82, 198.
Separate Property, 260, 23; 101, 175; 100, 284.
Separate Tracts, 181, 611.
Separate Trials, 60, 70; 88, 71.
Servant's Torts, 125, 344.
Service, 200, 52; 3, 68; 312, 107, 26, 125; 158, 250; 155, 278; 210, 420; 200, 468; 200, 492; 200, 516; 102, 536; 160, 535; 90, 511; 19, 580; 200, 588; 300, 612, 102, 536; 160, 535; 90, 511; 19, 580; 200, 588; 300, 612, 102, 536.
Service of Notice, 19, 155.
Service of Notice, 19, 155.
Service of Summons, 199, 516; 25, 364.
Setting Apart, 125, 19.
Setting Statement, 27, 15.
Setting Statement, 27, 15.
Settlement, 123, 19, 235, 24; 34, 174; 156, 202; 66, 222; 80, 247; 70, 233; 169, 297; 179, 323; 188, 367; 87, 391; 20, 412; 80, 438; 101, 439; 64, 429; 162, 586.
Settlement, 123, 19, 235, 84; 34, 174; 156, 502; 66, 222; 80, 248; 177, 359; 186, 361; 188, 540.
Settlement, 123, 19, 235, 84; 34, 174; 156, 202; 66, 222; 80, 248; 104, 439; 64, 429; 162, 586.
Settlement, 123, 19, 235, 34; 34, 174; 156, 202; 66, 222; 80, 248; 177, 838; 177, 852; 186, 610; 88, 567; 87, 391; 20, 412; 80, 438; 101, 439; 64, 429; 162, 586.
Settlement, 27, 15, 506; 509, 247; 156, 507; 156, 507; 156,
               Slander of Title, 147, 273.
Sleeve Nut, 142, 345.
Smelting Ores, 115, 560.
Societies, 152, 538.
Solicitors for Local Firms, 159, 441.
          Societies, 152, 535.
Solicitors for Local Firms, 159, 441.
Soldier, 41, 172.
Soldier, 44, 172.
Soldier, 44, 172.
Soldier, 44, 172.
Special, 109, 344.
Special, 109, 344.
Special Findings, 259, 165; 177, 153; 18, 171; 151, 273.
Special Findings, 259, 165; 177, 153; 18, 171; 151, 273.
Special Proceedings, 2, 579.
Special Proceedings, 2, 579.
Special Taxation, 188, 563.
Special Terrore, 47, 881.
Specific Devise, 198, 371.
Specific Devise, 198, 371.
Specific Performance, 103, 187, 167, 51; 117, 73; 169, 75; 182 to 184, 132; 26, 147, 73, 149, 180, 153; 177, 178; 33, 197; 178 to 181, 275; 58, 56, 320; 176, 532; 179, 180, 346; 179 to 182, 370, 371; 65, 76, 391; 122, 440; 187, 188, 443; 30, 460; 177, 178, 467; 55, 467; 56, 89; 172, 491; 69, 510; 121, 512; 179, 515; 58, 564; 175, 589; 77, 555; 172, 610.
Specification of Land, 198, 102.
```

```
Speculative, 64, 319.
Speculation, 183, 251.
```

```
Stoppage in Transitu, 277, 106.
Store Orders, 35, 461.
Stranded Vessel, 164, 491.
Stranger, 184, 51.
Sheets, 219, 103; 135, 130; 67, 173; 169, 203; 129, 225; 56, 245; 134, 345; 144, 394; 144, 441; 141, 513; 68, 557; 131, 140, 595; 58, 66, 605; 174, 610.
Street Assessment, 220, 103; 145, 152; 145, 441.
Street Cars, 22, 340.
Street Improvements, 221, 103; 136, 130; 132, 537.
Street Railways, 306, 77; 23, 147; 178, 323; 139, 459; 154, 561; 167, 857; 174, 510.
Street Sprinking, 222, 103.
Strict Foreclosure, 120, 224.
Strick Information, 222, 103.
Strict Foreclosure, 120, 224.
Stricking from Files, 147, 369.
Subcontractor, 129, 513.
Subcontractor, 129, 513.
Subconding, 176, 21.
Submission, 23, 94; 8, 291.
Subconding, 176, 21.
Submission, 23, 94; 8, 291.
Subsequent, 32, 565.
Subsequent Strick, 36, 51; 88, 149; 169, 153; 182, 154; 180, 178; 192, 276; 187, 391; 180, 467.
Subsequent Ag, 565.
Subsequent Mortgage, 34, 509.
Subsequent Mortgage, 34, 193.
Subficiency, 16, 18; 86, 174; 145, 226; 21, 340; 73, 414; 72, 486; 186, 663.
Sufficiency of Evidence, 24, 14; 21, 94; 10, 14, 171; 150, 177; 15, 244; 14, 412.
Survey, 28, 69; 21, 106; 105, 208; 104, 187, 508, 128.
Surveyor, 88, 128.
Survival, 121, 129; 89, 320.
Survival, 121, 129; 89, 320.
Survivorship, 188, 179.
Suspension of, 185, 21.
Suspension, 107, 226.
Sustaining Judgment, 247, 104.
Swamp Land, 100, 466.
Swearing Jury, 126, 333.
Swearing in Public Street, 98, 98.
Swearing in Public Street, 98, 98.
Sweitches, 189, 160, 297.
Switch Stands, 166, 297.
Tags, 180, 208.
Taking Possession, 255, 25.
```

Torts of Servants, 141, 417.

```
Tow, 38, 123; 25, 340; 34, 486.
Towing, 21, 484.
Towing, 21, 484.
Towing, 21, 484.
Towing, 21, 484.
Towage into Stream, 178, 183.
Towns, 275, 25; 193, 164; 83, 223; 184, 227; 187, 324; 192, 193, 419; 186, 482; 92, 583; 78, 487; 82, 606.
Town Marshal, 137, 130.
Township, 139, 74; 180, 182; 174, 442.
Total Loss, 169, 20; 99, 228.
"Trade and Exchange," 67, 198.
Trade secrets, 199, 468.
Trading, 86, 487.
Transaction with Deceased, 309, 310, 107; 200, 204; 199, 492.
Transaction with Deceased, 309, 310, 107; 200, 204; 199, 492.
Transfer to Treasury, 79, 538.
Transeript, 152, 468; 8, 555; 49, 50, 557; 33, 604.
Transfer to Packages, 138, 273.
Transfer to Packages, 138, 273.
Transfer to Packages, 138, 273.
Transinon, 43, 485.
Transportation, 177, 275; 111, 607.
Travelers, 85, 511.
Treasurer, 38, 45; 63, 96.
Treatment, 48, 485.
Transportation, 177, 275; 111, 607.
Travelers, 85, 511.
Treasurer, 38, 45; 63, 96.
Treatment, 48, 485.
Treplae Damages, 140, 225.
Trees, 173, 291, 218, 218, 2283, 26; 170, 171, 51; 253, 79; 94, 98; 27, 265; 104, 2125; 190, 151, 152; 185, 178; 197, 204; 56, 245; 28; 29, 604.
Trespass by Animals, 69, 222.
Trespass by Animals, 69, 222.
Trespass to Try Title, 243, 78; 142, 100; 192, 154; 150, 177; 186, 178; 199, 347; 187, 371; 186, 867; 185, 510; 165, 586; 184, 587; 188, 611.
Trespasser; 57, 271; 141, 294; 190, 396; 14, 580.
Trial, 244 to 243, 24; 86, 87, 91; 88, 89, 72; 175, 75; 251, 79; 257 to 259, 106; 71, 127; 156, 152; 167, 153; 194, 154; 158, 159, 202; 199, 206; 108, 224; 160, 250; 185, 186, 251; 29, 268; 121, 122, 272; 152, 273; 61, 319; 13, 310; 60, 342, 67, 366; 53, 605.
Trial Evidence, 2, 488.
Trial by Jury, 95, 96; 55, 16; 33, 197.
Trial de Novo, 16, 14; 51, 557.
Trover and Conversion, 284, 26; 171 to 187, 51; 284, 285, 80; 287, 400; 107, 98; 289, 171, 194, 187, 188, 198, 199, 197, 199, 194; 195, 198, 198, 198; 197, 109, 198, 198; 197, 109, 198, 198; 198; 199, 109, 198, 19
                                     Tunnel, 168, 323; 137, 430.

Tunnel Claims, 212, 103.

Tunnel Culams, 212, 103.

Turning out Convicts, 88, 97.

Turnpike, 102, 415; 191, 448; 198, 563.

Turnpike Company, 59, 535.

Tutors, 83, 174.

Two Indictments, 51, 298.

Two Sentences, 52, 298.

Two Sentences, 52, 298.

Two Years' Prior Use, 116, 488.

Type-writer, 44, 485.

Ultra Vires, 27, 604.

Umathila, 102, 489.

Unavoidable Accident, 211, 77.

Uncertainty, 157, 322; 182, 371; 123, 488; 4, 532; 54, 605.

Uuchastity, 66, 366.

Uncontradicted Evidence, 4, 603.

Undivided Interest, 121, 78.

Undue Influence, 199, 252; 196, 298; 199, 396; 70, 437; 198, 199, 448; 201, 563; 196, 588.

Unemployed Funds, 60, 269.

Unguarded Hatch, 176, 467.

Uniformity, 185, 324.

United States Circuit Court, 115, 344.

United States Circuit Court, 115, 344.

United States Courts, 72, 510.

United States Law, 70, 557.
```

United States License, 181, 102. United States Prisoners, 120, 393. Unlawful Assembly, 70, 71. Uniawful Hours, 163, 21. Uniawful Seizure, 40, 126, 174, 589. Unnecessary Matters, 38, 197. Unpatented Land, 184, 528. Unrecorded Deed, 49, 221; 113, 295. Urgency, 100, 348. Use, 44, 221. Use of to Defraud, 150, 490. Use, 162, 101.

Waiver by Parent, 148, 20.
Waiver by Tort, 111, 248.
Waiver of Priority, 138, 152.
Waiver of Priority, 138, 152.
Waiver of Trial 17, 14.
Waivering Grantor, 102, 72.
Waivering Tort, 288, 106.
Want of Prosecution, 159, 131.
Want of Prosecution, 159, 131.
Want of Signals, 22, 48.
War Claims, 32, 32.
Warrant, 81, 77, 86, 177; 126, 225; 126, 272; 139, 296; 140, 322; 12, 340; 64, 366; 188, 371; 39, 581.
Warrant, 91, 71, 56, 177; 126, 225; 126, 272; 139, 296; 140, 322; 12, 340; 64, 366; 188, 371; 39, 581.
Warrant, 189, 52; 45, 70; 266, 70; 275, 106; 34, 147; 108, 175; 192, 175; 175 to 176, 203; 162, 274; 36, 202; 35, 283; 71, 319; 164, 367; 174, 370; 117, 416; 156, 441; 184, 442; 193, 488; 49, 496; 198, 486; 82, 538; 148, 561; 100, 607.
Watches, 146, 345.
Watches, 146, 345.
Watches, 146, 345.
Watches, 12, 26; 297, 298, 107; 196, 204; 191, 324; 191, 371; 72, 557; 192, 584.
Water Companies, 190, 540; 104, 559.
Water Company, 299, 107; 21, 603.
Water-courses, 237, 78; 116, 99; 298, 107; 94, 247.
Water Privileges, 143, 465.
Water and Water-courses, 204, 154; 197, 275; 199, 347; 194, 443; 190, 588; 190, 611.
Ways, 193, 179; 197, 204; 192, 524; 192, 871; 197, 568; 61, 582.
Waxed Paper, 153 to 158, 397.
Wasted Paper, 153 to 158, 397.
Wasted Point, 178, 297.
Waith of Defendant, 120, 368.
Weight, 75, 342; 10, 364; 167, 419.
Weight of Evidence, 25, 26, 14; 14, 15, 68; 18, 22, 94; 160, 131; 17; 17; 12, 17; 19, 17; 19, 187; 197, 555; 10, 589; 9, 608; 165, 510.
West Point, 178, 297.
Wharves, 201, 429; 121, 492; 67, 606. Weight of Evidence, 25, 26, 14; 14, 15, 69; 18, 22, 94; 160, 131; 17; 17; 12; 17; 10; 340; 137, 345; 23; 24, 364; 65, 44; 167, 442; 10, 484; 14, 15, 508; 9, 532; 12, 535; 18, 580; 9, 608; 165, 610.
West Point, 178, 297.
Wharves, 201, 420; 121, 492; 67, 606.
Wheelbarrows, 148, 177.
Whoelbarrows, 148, 178.
Widower, 98, 294.
Wife, 144, 74.
Wife's Acknowledgment, 98, 343.
Wife's Property, 97, 150.
Wife's Bignature, 85, 606.
Wild Land, 75, 366.
Wild, 292 to 298, 26; 190 to 198, 52; 34, 69; 246, 78; 300 to 307, 107; 205 to 218, 154, 155; 194 to 199, 179; 198, 206; 198 to 198, 228; 115; 248; 192 to 199, 251; 229; 198, 199, 275; 81, 284; 198, 209, 296; 188, 193 to 197, 324; 200, 347; 149, 369; 193 to 196, 201, 201; 198, 468; 199 to 197, 492; 193 to 197, 515, 516; 191 to 196, 540; 191 to 196, 589; 196 to 196, 52; 229, 78; 308 to 310, 107; 73, 127; 50, 148; 167; 153; 214 to 216, 155; 51, 198; 307; 107; 199, 200, 204; 110, 248; 200, 252; 30, 35, 268; 57, 298; 188.
298; 136, 345; 78, 366; 199, 571; 79, 391; 161 295; 200, 388; 200; 200, 209, 420; 12, 460; 199, 468; 60, 468; 198, 198, 402; 2, 507; 198, 516; 65, 534; 179, 537; 65, 588; 97, 559; 198 to 201, 563; 200; 202 to 204, 563, 564; 199, 588; 588, 605.
Words Actionable Per Se., 175, 238; 116, 236; 200, 388; 200; 202 to 204, 563, 564; 199, 683; 60, 468; 198, 198, 462; 200, 208; 198, 200; 202; 16, 412.
Worthiess Claim, 148, 278.
Worten Moelbartows, 188, 365.
Writ, 72, 605. Wrongful Act, 96, 72. Wrongful Attachment, 183, 560; 165, 562. Wrongful Selzure, 63, 46.